BIBLE EXAMINER.

"THIS IS THE RECORD, THAT GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, AND THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON. HE THAT HATH THE SON, HATH LIFE; AND HE THAT HATH NOT THE SON, HATH NOT LIFE."

Vol. 15. No. 1.] **JANUARY, 1863.** [Whole No. 220.

THE DOOM OF THE UNGODLY:

OR, THE WICKED DEAD REMAIN ETERNALLY UNDER DEATH'S DOMINION.

A SERMON BY GEO. STORRS, EDITOR OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

[The substance of this discourse was delivered at Philadelphia, and reported Phonographically by Joseph McFarland.]

TEXT: "Give me understanding and I shall live." Ps. 119: 144. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." Prov. 21: 16.

THE distinct utterances of these portions of inspiration give us confidence in pursuing our inquiry, and in presenting the subject to attention. The first text being from the most pious and honored of Israel's kings, announcing the way of life, and the other from the wisest of those kings, distinctly stating that some "shall REMAIN in the congregation of the dead," seem ample authority for our investigating the subject; and such company as these two kings, may prevent even the timid from being alarmed in search after the truth.

Truth is harmonious in all its parts—the links of which cannot be separated without detriment to the whole chain. It is therefore not a matter of indifference as to what a man may believe, as many suppose. If he believe the truth he will doubtless be benefitted by it; but he will derive much more benefit from a clear perception of the *whole* truth than a part of it.—When the Saviour prayed, "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth," He prayed, in effect, that we should all feel the force, and understand the importance of truth. So that

whatever phase of that truth may be presented, it demands our attention, and should not be put aside. No one should undertake to say, therefore, that he has *sufficient* truth and does not wish to perplex his mind with abstract notions or irrelevant issues. The point to be examined is not merely what is truth; but how much is it necessary for us to entertain and to apply for our welfare? It does not become us to isolate passages of Scripture or to dwell upon a particular text to the exclusion of nearly every other: for the truth, as it is revealed to us from God, runs in harmonious streams through both the Old and the New Testament.

We have heard persons frequently say, in reply to certain quotations: "Ah! that is from the Old Testament!" as if it were not worth our while to regard the fitness and self-evidence of anything emanating from that source. But Christ bade the Jews "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." Now what "Scriptures" were they directed to search? As the New Testament was not then written, they must have been referred to the Old Testament; and hence we have not only our Saviour's reference to those "Scriptures," but also His declaration that they testify of *eternal life*. The apostle Paul, likewise, in his discourses to the Jews, repeatedly directs their attention to the Old Testament. For example, when he stood before Agrippa, he claimed to have taught nothing but what Moses and the prophets had said should come to pass, and our Lord, after His resurrection, said to his disciples: "Oh! fools" (literally, *unwise*) "and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken; *** and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

There are some Christians who are prone to think that the New Testament supersedes the Old; but on the contrary, the latter serve as a key to the former—they are essential to a just appreciation and proper understanding of them. But let us add, that a theological theory has never yet been started without encountering some apparent or real contradictory texts; else the world had never been divided into so many radically different religious denominations. One class range themselves

on the side of certain texts that represent their theological ideas; another class, taking exception to these, discover flaws and contradictions, and settle down upon opposite texts, and so on.

We conclude, therefore, the only means of arriving at a clear apprehension of the truth is to determine the general tenor of the Scriptures, and then construe the discordant texts in harmony with it. For many passages are susceptible of more than one construction; but the construction which approximates most nearly the general tenor of the Scriptures, and harmonizes best with the known perfections of God, should be regarded as the true one, and adopted. The texts we have chosen as the foundation of our investigation on this occasion, seem flatly to contradict the view generally received by Christendom; and it must, therefore, be submitted to the test previously recommended.

The term *resurrection* does not occur in the Old Testament, but there are many corresponding phrases, such as "awake—arise—Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell!—Thy dead men shall live," etc.; which expressions in no instance have the remotest allusion to the wicked dead. In the New Testament the word *resurrection* frequently occurs, as well as numerous equivalent terms; for example, "*rise, raised, rising, raise, rose, risen*," &c., but none of them are ever used with reference to a future life of the wicked, unless in the negative form, as "*not rise; not see life*," &c. Such terms and phrases as denote future life, belong exclusively to the righteous, and in the Scriptures are applied to them alone; so that there is not, from Genesis to Revelation, a text which declares that the wicked dead shall live again, or that they shall have a future life at all; yet there are a few texts from which it may be *inferred*.

Our object at this time will be to define the prospects of dying men—to learn God's purposes, as revealed in His word, in relation to the children of Adam—to reveal to the sinner the nature of his doom—eternal death—and thereby awaken him to the fact that unless he repent and come to Christ he will perish forever "like the beasts that perish." "Well, there is nothing very alarming in such a prospect," he may say; but to those who enjoy life—who rightly estimate its value—it is an

awful prospect, indeed. Let us turn to and contemplate the picture presented by Job 24 : 19, 20.

"Drought and heat consume the snow waters : so doth the grave those which have sinned. The womb shall forget him ; the worm shall feed sweetly on him ; he shall be no more remembered ; and wickedness shall be broken as a tree."

The term which is here translated "grave," is *sheol*, in the original—the place or state of the dead : the hidden state.—And here it is stated clearly and unequivocally, *sheol* shall *consume* the wicked as heat consumes the snow waters : no analogy could be more striking, nor could any language be more expressive of the end of "those which have sinned."

The Psalmist says, in the 49th Psalm : "They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches ; *** their inward thought is that their houses shall continue forever, and their dwelling places to all generations ; they call their lands after their own names. Nevertheless, man being in honor abideth not ; he is like the beasts that perish."

"What!" exclaims one—"would you reduce man to the level of a beast?" The Psalmist has done it ; or rather God, who inspired the Psalmist by His Spirit, and we can only reply in His words, "Like sheep they are laid in the grave ; death shall feed on them ; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning ; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling :" or as the margin reads, "The grave being a habitation to every one of them." The grave, then, is their abode ; and there they must lie forever : but the Psalmist in the next verse says of himself, by way of contrast :—"God will redeem *my* soul from the power of the grave ; for he shall receive me."

Let us pass on to Isaiah 26 : 14. Here the prophet after having spoken of certain "other lords" who had ruled over his people, says : "They are dead, they shall not live ; they are deceased, they shall not rise ; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." And why shall they "*not rise*"? Because, "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding *shall remain* in the congregation of the dead." How important that we pray with David, "Give me understanding and I shall live." Such shall *not* "remain in the congregation of the dead"—"I will raise *him* up at the last day," saith Jesus, who is "the resurrection and *the life*."

It is frequently claimed that the text Isa. 26 : 14 has reference to the final destruction of the wicked, which event, it is said, will occur a thousand years after the coming of the Lord, or at least *after* the resurrection of all the dead. Such a conclusion, however, is erroneous, as will be readily perceived from the contrast presented in the 19th verse. Keeping in mind the previous text, to wit : "They are dead : they shall not rise"—the 19th verse says, "*Thy* dead men *shall live :* together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake, and sing," &c. Here as may be seen, the final condition of the two classes is described—long prior to the resurrection—in language too plain to be misunderstood.

Again, in Isa. 43 : 17, we read, "Which bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and the power ; they shall lie down together, they shall not rise ; they are extinct, *they are quenched as tow.*" Also in Jer. 51 : 39, the following language is employed : "In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and *not awake*, saith the LORD." Similar language characterises the 57th verse, likewise : "And I will make drunk her princes and her wise men, her captains and her rulers, and her mighty men : and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not awake saith the King whose name is the LORD of hosts."

The words of the prophet Amos are equally emphatic on this point, chap. 8, last verse : "They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy God, O Dan, liveth ; and the manner of Beersheba liveth ; even they shall fall and *never rise again*."

Thus far we have given a fair sample of the evidence of the Old Testament in rebuttal of the prevalent doctrine of a general rising of the dead to life. The passages we have quoted leave no room for inference—unless other texts of the O. T. as plainly contradict them—which cannot be pretended—they apply clearly and directly to the point, and must be intelligible, even, to the most uncultivated mind.

We shall now proceed to examine the bearing of the New Testament on the subject ; but surely no one can for a moment maintain that either Christ or his apostles ever contradicted

the prophets of old? Admitting a text, even,—if such could be—which positively affirms the wicked dead shall live again, what then? Shall we, like the infidel, throw the Book away contemptuously, because it seemingly teaches a different doctrine? No! But our task should be to scrutinize closely to ascertain whether, after all, such discordant texts are not susceptible of a meaning, or interpretation that shall form a link that supplies the seeming break in the great chain of sacred truth. If a text is possibly capable of two interpretations, that certainly should be chosen which is most in harmony with the known or revealed character of God and the general teaching of Scripture. We must determine at the outset, as in the case of the Old Testament, the general tenor or drift of the New. We find the general tenor of the New Testament expressed in a single text; namely, John 3: 16. "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Here it is manifest, that not an individual member of the human family could have had a resurrection, if Jesus Christ had not come into the world. Of the millions that have successively populated the earth, none could ever return to life but for the redemption through Christ; all must have remained with their kindred dust, according to the law which prescribed their doom: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return!" But how is this redemption obtained? The question is answered in John 6: 40: "This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."

The antithesis of this declaration, namely, "I will raise him up at the last day," logically and necessarily implies that those who do not believe on the Son will *not* be raised up at the last day. The apostle John also says that God has "given us eternal life," and that "*this life is in His Son.*"

Paul said that he labored and suffered that he might be made conformable to Christ's death—that he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead,—or as the original may be construed —"the resurrection *out from among the dead ones.*" So then, Paul must have understood that of the two classes, but one would have a resurrection, and he therefore strove that he might be numbered with that class. With the apostles, the resurrection of the dead was the great fundamental principle of the Gospel. On this they "harped" continually, until it became a pivot around which everything else seemed made to revolve. They sought earnestly to convince their hearers that by the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ mankind would be raised from the dead; but that if they lived "after the flesh" they should die, and death would exercise eternal dominion over them. Hence, the general tenor of the New Testament is, that there is a future life which will be eternal,—not *temporary*—a life peculiar to the righteous, which nowhere in Scripture is affirmed of the ungodly. To the Sadducees, who denied the possibility of a resurrection, Christ replied: "They who are accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." That is to say, that we, by natural birth, are the children of Adam—of the flesh; and as that which is born of the flesh must perish with the flesh, we can only attain to a new life—the resurrection life—by means of the Spirit of God, the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead.

We might multiply similar texts; but think that enough have been quoted to establish the general tenor of both the Old and the New Testament in reference to the doctrine of the resurrection.

We will now refer to several texts which have been urged against our view of the subject. The one which is most generally used to demolish us, is to be found in 1 Cor. 15: 22. We will introduce it by a few brief remarks on the context. The apostle says: "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

There are two ways in which this form of expression may be understood. The word *also* may refer to the supposition that Christ must have perished if He had not been raised from the dead; or it may refer to the wicked, who, not being "in Christ," had died and perished. But to whichever case it may apply, it is evident that unless a man be raised from the dead he has perished.

The text relied on by some of our opponents reads thus :—"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Allow me to remark, I once asked our late Br. Henry Grew, in this hall, whether he intended to use this text against the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked, in the discussion then going on between him and myself in the BIBLE EXAMINER? He replied, "I do not; the apostle was evidently speaking of the righteous only." Such is the natural inference. Among the Corinthians who had professed faith in Christ, some might ask, "If we are to have a future life—if we are to live beyond the grave, why do we saints die? Why are we buried in the grave?" They said, probably, "Well, if that be true that we must go down to the grave, there *cannot* be life hereafter: if there is to be such life, why are we not translated?" But what said the apostle? "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable; but now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept."

What is the "first fruits"? It consists of the first gathering of the crop, as a sample of it: and such was Christ. He was the "first fruits" of the dead—not of the wicked dead—He was no sample of such a harvest—but He was a pledge of the quality of the harvest that was to come. The apostle continues :—"For since by man" (that is Adam) "came death, by man" (Jesus), "also, came the resurrection of the dead." Again :—"For as in Adam all die"—all who? You may say, "all mankind;" but the apostle is evidently speaking of those, and those only, who agreed with, or are like the sample or "first fruits," viz., the believers in Him: or those who were like Him. But why do they die? Because of their connection with Adam; but "in Christ shall all be made alive." The wicked are not in Christ nor like the "first fruits," and so are not embraced in the *all* to be made alive; for "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature:" but we have all a connection with the first Adam—a relationship of the flesh; therefore, we are all subject to mortality, corruption, and death, in which terminates the life received from our earthly progenitor. But God has provided a Second Adam with a life that shall never end; and in order that we may obtain that life we must be united to Him

—must have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This life the apostle designates in Rom. 8, as "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," and saith, it "hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Now, if that "law of the Spirit of life" is not in us, what is to make us free from "the law of sin and death"? how are we to be emancipated? Hence, it is evident the apostle is speaking only of the righteous. He does not affirm corruptibility of one class and incorruptibility of another; but states broadly that "*we* shall ALL be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." If the resurrection embraces the wicked, they must be raised to incorruptibility; and it follows that they will either be eternally miserable or else they will be saved, inasmuch as they cannot "die any more." There is no escape from these conclusions by those who maintain that the "*all* made alive," verse 22, includes all men, irrespective of moral state; for the apostle makes no distinction between the "all" in that verse and the "all" in verses 51 and 52; so that if "in Christ shall *all* be made alive," is of universal application, so also is the expression "We shall not *all* sleep, but we shall ALL be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and THE DEAD shall be raised INCORRUPTIBLE and we shall be changed."

Thus our opponents are compelled, by their theory, to take eternal misery in their course or universal salvation: one or the other is inevitable. They may sneer at us for saying so, but that does not alter the truth. The testimony of the apostle is so clear and distinct that no unbiased mind can avoid the conclusion. Look at verses 42–44: "They are* sown in *corruption;* they are raised in INCORRUPTION: they are sown in *dishonor;* they are raised IN GLORY: they are sown in weakness; they are raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a *spiritual* body." Thus the state and condition of those raised from the dead is settled beyond all reasonable controversy; and fortunately for the race, the apostle has settled the question that "the dead" who are raised, are "raised in *incorruption—in glory,*" and "*spiritual.*" Thus universalism is the result to which the apostle drives the advocates of a universal reliving of the dead. They may say, boastingly, "I would not

* We insert "They are" instead of "It is" on the authority of Wakefield, and Prof. Murdock's translation of the Syriac

deny the first part" [of the chap., viz., v. 22,] "for fear of believing the rest, nor pervert half because I did not understand the whole." If the boaster does "not understand the whole," how does he know he understands verse 22? May he not be mistaken or ignorant in that matter as well as the other? Surely, a little modesty would be serviceable to such teachers. But "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty look before a fall." Inspiration has settled the fact, in unequivocal language, that "the man that wandereth out of the way of understanding SHALL REMAIN in the congregation of the dead"—he "shall NOT SEE life, but the wrath of God ABIDETH on him." Shall any man be allowed to disannul such testimony, by a criticism on 1 Cor. 15: 22 which is not only worthless, but contradicts the whole scope of the apostle's reasoning in that chapter?—Even if it were admitted that text *might* be read, *by* Christ, instead of *in* Christ, it would not help the advocate of a universal reliving of the dead; for as "all die" by having a *union* with Adam, "even so" those who are "made alive" must be made so by having a *union* with Christ. It is the *union* with these two heads that affects the condition of men for death or life. Adam did not by an act of mere power put all his posterity under death: the union of *nature* with him is what brings death to the race: "even so" Christ, the second Adam, does not by a mere act of power give life to any one; but a union of *nature* with Him brings them into life again. "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." "As we have borne the *image* of the earthy" (Adam), "we shall also bear the *image* of the heavenly" (Adam). The first brings death to *all* connected with him: the second brings life to *all* connected with Him. All others "utterly perish in their own corruption" and do "not see life," because they rejected or neglected the LIFE-GIVER.

The next attempt of the advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead to force Paul to their side, is a resort to Acts 24: 15; and like most others who have a desperate case to make out, they disregard the apostle's premises and make him contradict his entire teaching elsewhere.

Paul opens this discourse, "I confess unto thee" [Felix, the

Governor] "that after the way which they" [the Jews, his accusers] "call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, BELIEVING ALL THINGS WRITTEN IN THE LAW AND IN THE PROPHETS." Where is it written in the law or the prophets that the wicked or unjust shall live, or have a resurrection from the dead?—ANS.—*No where.* But it is written of some of them, "They are dead; they shall not live: they are deceased, they shall not rise"—"they are like the beasts that perish," &c. And this testimony Paul believed; for he testified, he believed "*all* things written in the law and in the prophets." Is he in the next breath giving the lie to this utterance? He did not deal in "yea and nay," for he declares to the Corinthians, his preaching was not "yea and nay," but that it "was *yea*." 2 Cor. 1: 19. "Believing all things written," &c., "and have hope toward God, which"—"which" *what?* To what does *which* refer? Not to something to be said, but to something already spoken. What then is the antecedent of which? Clearly, it is "*hope*": "which [hope] they themselves also allow" [by maintaining] "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both" [or, *not only*] "of the just and" [or, but *also* of the] "unjust."

The argument is clearly this: The complaint of the Jews against me is groundless: for, while I preach the resurrection of the just, or those in Christ, and they persecute me for doing so, they, in fact, allow by their doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust, all that my "hope" embraces, inasmuch as the whole embraces *the part* which is the subject of my hope. "I stand and am judged for the hope of the PROMISE made of God unto the fathers"***"why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" said Paul before Agrippa. His *hope* was based on the promise of God to the fathers: that promise did not embrace the unjust, and no *threat* of a resurrection is found "written in the law or the prophets." Thus Paul's language, Acts 24: 15, gives no countenance to the idea that his faith embraced the resurrection of the wicked dead: besides he clearly recognizes the fact that at the time of the resurrection some would "remain in the congregation of the dead;" for he says, I labor and suffer, "*if* by ANY MEANS I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3: 11. Thus he distinctly

states the fact that a revival from the dead is *conditional*, and not the lot of all men.

We regard this point as settled beyond all reasonable doubt, that Paul had no resurrection, in his gospel, for the unjust or wicked dead: and as he did "not shun to declare unto" men "ALL the counsel of God," and never declared the living again of those who die in their sins, we may be sure he did not hold any such theory.

Some brief remarks on John 5: 28, 29 is all we have time for now. This text has its difficulties, we admit; but what view of Scripture doctrine finds no texts of difficulty? It were easy to show how true it is that all theories have difficulties, else there would be no adverse sects in Christendom.

Our Lord and His apostles made all their appeals to the law and the prophets: this we have abundantly shown. Whatever then be the import of John 5: 28, 29, it cannot contradict the Old Testament teaching, and does not, therefore, teach that those who have "done evil" come into "life," whatever else it teaches. "They that have done good, unto the resurrection of LIFE": they *live*. "They that have done evil, unto the resurrection of *condemnation*:"—condemned to what? "He that believeth not shall NOT SEE LIFE, but the wrath of God ABIDETH on him"—such are condemned to "REMAIN in the congregation of THE DEAD." John 3: 36; Prov. 21: 16. In this view the antithesis is perfect. God hath given His Son "authority to execute judgment:" He does it, "at the last day," by His power over all the living and dead—good and bad: to the good, He gives life: the bad, He *condemns* to "remain in the congregation of the dead"—leaves the "wrath of God" abiding "on them." Thus He judgeth "the quick and the dead at His appearing and kingdom." 2 Tim. 4: 1.

If any still insist the doers of evil must be made alive, because it is said they "shall hear his voice and come forth," and ask, how could this be if they were not made alive? We reply by asking them a like question on Ezek. 37. How could the "dry bones hear the word of the Lord" unless made alive? But they did hear; and as the prophet "prophesied, there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. And the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above; but there was *no breath* in them."—They were not alive; yet they heard the voice of the prophet and obeyed. Thus we have inspired testimony that the dead, without life, are said to hear and obey; and until it can be proved, the wicked dead will have life at the resurrection, "at the last day," we may rest assured they "shall not see life"—they have "NO LIFE in" them, because they did not "eat my flesh" nor "drink my blood," as saith Jesus, John 6: 53; they have no connection with the life-giving power, and perish forever in their own corruptible nature.

We might go a step further on the subject as illustrated by Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones: we might admit all the dead wicked would come as near to life as the dry bones did, while there was "no breath in them." What then? Were they alive? *No.* What is lacking? The vitalizing element. What is that? We have no account of any other for dead men, at the last day, but the Spirit of God. But the wicked never had that dwelling in them; and though God should cause them to come out of their graves, and clothe them with flesh anew, what is to give them life? The Spirit of life enters only into God's people—"I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and * * * put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live:" Ezk. 37: 13, 14. "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8: 11.

But "I don't believe the wicked dead will come out of their graves and not be made alive," says an objector. Well, we do not ask you to believe it; we only say, it is far more scriptural and reasonable to suppose such to be the fact, than to believe they will be made alive to be tormented and killed again; and moreover the Scriptures, speaking of the people of God, say, "They shall go forth, and look upon the CARCASSES of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched: and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh." Isa. 66: 24.

If the advocates of the resurrection of wicked men will have it so, why so be it; but their resurrection will give nothing but *carcasses* to these dead: carcasses which will be an abhorrence

to all living men. These "carcasses" "shall remain in the congregation of THE DEAD," and "not see life."

But some persons sneer at the idea that *carcasses* shall be brought from the graves to be treated thus. They say, "That is a horrible idea"—they "have heard of savages that thus treated the dead bodies of their enemies; but it is shocking to attribute such a thing to God"! Happy that their sensibilities can be shocked by something; but to them there is nothing to disturb their "pure minds" in the idea that God should make those carcasses alive and then torture that life out of them again! That is all right, in their estimation! They can "strain at a gnat, but swallow a camel" as calmly as if taking a sweet morsel!

We give these objectors to raising lifeless carcasses to shame and dishonor, and to show it is a punishment in God's estimation, Jer. 7: 1, 2. The contents of the chapter commences—"*The calamites to the Jews both* DEAD *and* ALIVE." What are those calamities to the dead? "At that time, saith the LORD, they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah and the bones of the princes, and the bones of the priests, and the bones of the prophets, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, out of their graves: and they shall spread them before the sun, and the moon, and all the hosts of heaven, whom they have loved, and whom they have served, and after whom they have walked, and whom they have sought, and whom they have worshiped: they shall not be gathered, nor buried: they shall be dung upon the face of the earth."

If the Son of man shall thus cause all the doers of evil to "come forth" from "the graves" to "condemnation," not to see life, but to be "dung upon the face of the earth"—whose "carcasses shall be an abhorring to all flesh," who shall say John 5: 28, 29 is not fulfilled to the very letter?

And now, O sinner, a word to you, and we have done. If you remain impenitent, still rejecting or neglecting God's mercy in Christ; and grieving the Holy Spirit of God, by which alone you can ever be prepared for life, or revived from the dead, your eternal doom will soon overtake you—the night of death will set in upon you—a night from which you will never awake—a night of eternal gloom: no redemption will ever come to

you! Will you persist in a course of sin, with your eyes open to such an awful doom? Will you still listen to the serpent's song—"Ye shall not surely die"? O, beware of that father of lies! "The wages of sin is *death*:" but God, in His infinite mercy offers you life—*in* and through Jesus Christ our Redeemer—that shall never end: a life, the joys of which shall never be interrupted and never cease: a life, increasing in new glories, in the midst of unbounded means for new delights, with holy and glorious society, amid seas of shoreless love, ever fresh and refreshing. O, what a state! what a life! what rapturous scenes! and no alloy! Say, sinner, will you have it? Do not say, *no!* Make haste to Christ the LIFE-GIVER! Make no delay! Time is hasting on, and soon the last sand of thy present life will fall; and then! O, *then*, have you this eternal life made sure to you! Arouse thyself, this moment! another, it may be too late, and all is lost, *eternally* LOST! O, "*why will you die*"! Come to Jesus, perishing sinner. He will receive you—take away your sins, and enroll your name in His "BOOK OF LIFE."

NOTE.—Those persons who wish to see our views more at large than in the foregoing discourse, will find them in a work of 96 pages, entitled "LIFE FROM THE DEAD: or, *The Righteous only will live again.*" See our Catalogue of "*Books and Pamphlets.*" That work was first published in 1857, after much inquiry, for several years. In our judgment, its main positions are unanswered and unanswerable. Those who have made any attempts against those views have carefully avoided approaching their foundation principles; such as "Punishment cannot exceed the threatening—that death is the only proper penalty or wages of sin—that the penalty is *not suffering*, nor the *pain* of dying, nor *dying* itself, but DEATH—*to be dead:* that no other penalty is known in the law of God, under any dispensation, as penalty proper, or the wages of sin, except one, *viz.:* DEATH." Till these points are met and overthrown, any assault on the author's view of some particular text, is unavailing. Let those who wish, try their skill against the foundation, and see if those principles are not immovable as eternal truth.

The foregoing Sermon may be issued in a "BIBLE EXAMINER *Tract*," at *five* cents per copy; which, with the author's work on "*Life from the Dead*," &c., will present his views of the subject. But if a full view of the whole question of *life*, as held by him, is desired, let the work "LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST" be called for. See *Catalogue* on last page. To those of our readers who think we say too much on the *non-revival* of the wicked dead, we must say, in our mind the whole subject of immortality is involved in this question, and it stands in the foreground of the whole subject of *life*. Such prominence we must give it, or prove unfaithful to our convictions.

"LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST:"

IS THE DOCTRINE UNIMPORTANT?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

WE lately received a letter from a friend, in which, after referring to "the non-resurrection question," he says, "If the doctrine in question is true, when compared with other doctrines of the Gospel, it is quite unimportant."

As this is the opinion of many others, who, like the author of the foregoing remark, have taken but a superficial view of the subject, it may be proper to give a public answer.

And first, "the non-resurrection question" is of great importance to all who hold the fundamental doctrine of the mortality of man; who believe that the natural man has no life but animal life, and that he *perishes* in the corruption which results from the loss of that life, unless God interposes his preventing power.

Any principle that necessitates an error must be erroneous.—If "the non-resurrection" doctrine is an error, then the doctrine which leads to it must be an error. The fundamental doctrine to which we have alluded *does* lead to, and necessitate the non-resurrection of every one who is not affected by Christ, the medium whereby God exerts his preventing, restoring, and immortalizing power. "God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth* in him may *not* perish." No provision has been made to save the *un*believer from perishing. He is left in his natural condition, a victim to the corruption which inevitably follows the cessation of the only life he has. The wrath wrought by the law (Rom. 4: 15) on the fleshly nature (Rom. 3: 20) "abideth on him." "It was on him, see ver. 18, in his state of darkness and nature—and can only be removed by faith in the Son of God, which he *has not.*" Alford on John 3: 36. How can he ever escape the dominion of death while "the sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law"? God has ordained "our Lord Jesus Christ" to give "us the victory." 1 Cor. 15: 58.

Here then, is the conclusion to which we are irresistibly led by

the fundamental doctrine of man's mortality: No Christian has a right to maintain a principle and reject its legitimate consequence. Either hold *both* or discard *both.* Let no one who holds the mortality of man and yet defends the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked *utter a word* against the adherents of orthodoxy until he can offer them a consistent substitute for their unscriptural belief. And if any one halts "between two opinions," resurrection and non-resurrection, let him not delude himself with the idea that the subject "is quite unimportant."

But "the non-resurrection question" is by no means the only question involved in the discussion. It is, perhaps, the best provocative to investigation that can be offered to a believer in the mortality of man. But the true glory of the subject is not manifested until its relation to the plan of salvation is shown. It then becomes of startling importance; the question of questions, surpassing every other as much as the sun exceeds the moon in brightness. Indeed, as the moon obtains its lustre from the sun, so does every other idea in the revelation of God reflect the light of this.

The doctrine of "Life only in Christ" unlocks the mystery that has enclosed *the Atonement* for ages. The popular belief of the *vicarious* death of Christ, that he suffered the penalty of the law *in our stead,* that the innocent Jesus bore the wrath of the violated law in order that condemned millions might go *scot-free,* has been and is now the ridicule of infidels and the perplexity of thinking Christians. Such a view impeaches the justice of God. The touchstone of Life in Christ condemns this theory, while it develops the solution of the mystery.

The death of Christ manifested the justice of God, which was seriously involved in His offer of a future life to a race that had been condemned, in the person of Adam, to a return to the dust from which they were taken, and *consequently,* to *non-existence.* The reflecting mind is compelled to inquire, How can God bestow a future life on Adam's race without *reversing* His decree of death?

No answer to this question was afforded until Jesus appeared. And Paul plainly tells us that Christ died to explain the matter. Whom God hath set forth, a propitiation by his blood through faith, *for a manifestation of His righteousness,* because of the

paresin (not *remission*, as in the common version, but as the reference reads *passing over*, in the sense of overlooking) of the sins before done, in the forbearance of God ; for a manifestation of His righteousness in the present time : that He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."—Rom. 3 : 25, 26.

The passing over of sins was evidenced in the promise of a future life to Abraham and his seed while the law held a claim on them, by which they were doomed to non-existence. Jesus was set forth to manifest God's righteousness. But how did his death do this ? By discovering to mankind a new life-principle which is not—like the animal life—forfeited to the law. Jesus died to manifest the justice of God in taking the forfeited life. He rose again to show a way of salvation from death by a life not forfeited. If he had possessed no other than animal life the wrath wrought by the law on the animal nature would have prevented his release from death. But he "through the eternal Spirit offered himself," and by that Spirit he was rescued.—"Being raised from the dead," he "dieth no more ; death hath no more dominion over him." "Having been put to death indeed in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit." Thus God can be just in taking the animal life from all who are in Adam, and yet the justifier to a spiritual life of all who are in Christ ; that is, all who have received "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead."

Will any one, in view of the foregoing, *dare* to affirm that the doctrine which thus opens to our understanding the Atonement by Jesus Christ "is quite unimportant" ? We hesitate not to say that it is the *most* important doctrine that can possibly be presented to the human mind. It is our fervent prayer that God through His blessed Spirit will indellibly seal this precious truth on our hearts, and make us bold as lions in its defense. The author of the remark which suggested this article will probably allow the subject to be of some importance, if we do not go so far as to compare it with other doctrines of "the Gospel." But we make no such comparison. We never *shall* do so, for in the lovely features of "Life only in Christ" we recognize THE GOSPEL ITSELF.

"The doctrine in question" is, moreover, most intensely *practical*. It is the most efficient means that can be employed to convict sinners. If the Holy Spirit may be expected to attend any kind of preaching, it may be looked for in connection with the faithful promulgation of this truth. It shows how utterly hopeless is the condition of the natural man. Without *help* he dies like the brute. He must be united to the *living* vine or perish. He must have the "one baptism," the baptism of the Holy Spirit, or he will be eternally held by death. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." "He that soweth to the Spirit shall *of the Spirit* reap life everlasting." But "he that soweth to his flesh shall *of the flesh* reap (not life corruptible, but) *corruption*."

It is not only practical with reference to the unregenerate, but also to the believer. It enables him to realize his true relations to God in this life. It shows him the incurable weakness of the flesh. As an animal being he can do nothing pleasing to the law of God. He is entirely dependent on the Spirit of God to help his infirmities and assist him in keeping "the body under."

We know not how to express our heartfelt thanks to our heavenly Father for His goodness, as manifested in bringing the radiant truth of "Life only in Christ" to our comprehension.—And if the whole world should unite in pronouncing it "quite unimportant," it would only stimulate us to the earnest, persistent, and uncompromising assertion of the contrary.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

PROPOSITION J.

The wicked perish like the beasts.

THE 49th Psalm is a sufficient support to this proposition.

"Hear this, all nations !
Give ear, all inhabitants of the world ;
Both low and high,
Rich and poor together !
My mouth shall speak wisdom,

And the meditation of my heart *is* understanding.
I will incline mine ear to a song,
I will open my dark saying upon the harp.
Wherefore should I fear in days of evil,
When the iniquity of my supplanters shall surround me?
Those who rely on their wealth,
And boast in the multitude of their riches;
A brother cannot by any means redeem,
A man cannot give to God his ransom,
(For the redemption of their life is precious,
And it ceaseth for ever.)
That he should still live forever,
And not see corruption.
For he shall see *it;* wise *men* must die;
Likewise the fool and stupid *person* must perish
And leave their wealth to others.
Their burial places *are* their houses for ever,
Their dwellings to all generations.
They laud their names in all lands;
Yet *such* a man in honor abideth not,
He is made like to the beasts *which* are destroyed.
This their way *is* their folly,
Yet their posterity delight in their portion. Selah.
Like a flock to sheol they drive;
Death is their shepherd;
And the righteous shall have dominion over them in the morning.
And their beauty shall consume;
Sheol from *henceforth is* their dwelling.
But God will redeem me from the hand of sheol,
For he will take me *out of it.* Selah.
Be not thou afraid because a man grows rich,
Because the glory of his house increases;
For when he dieth he shall carry nothing away.
His glory shall not descend after him.
(For in his life he will bless his soul,
And *others* will praise thee because thou doeth good to thyself.)
He shall go to the dwelling of his fathers,
They shall never see light.
Man *that is* in honor and understandeth not,
Is made like to the beasts *which* are destroyed."

(The foregoing translation is better than the common version, and, to our mind, as perfect a representation of the original as may be. If the present series of articles is deemed worthy of a more permanent form than they have in these columns, the propriety of the altered renderings will be fully shown. The *italic* words are used, as in the common translation, to fill "the gaps" left by the Hebrew.)

Our proposition will safely stand on either this or the vulgate version. The wicked, no matter how wealthy, cannot redeem himself nor his brother from the fate of mankind. Corruption is his portion; sheol his dwelling. God redeems the righteous from sheol, but he leaves the wicked to perish just as if there was no salvation provided. They shall never see light, but shall perish like the beasts.

Peter evidently had this Psalm in his mind when he said, in language alike emphatic, "These, as irrational brute beasts, born for prey and corruption, (speaking evil of the things which they understand not,) shall utterly perish in their own corruption." 2 Pet. 2: 12.

Sixth Argument

against the resurrection of the wicked.

Those who perish like the beasts will not have a resurrection.
But the wicked perish thus.
Therefore THE WICKED WILL NOT HAVE A RESURRECTION.

Proposition K.

The resurrection is a provision of the plan of salvation through Christ.

We can safely assume this proposition. Richard Watson, a close thinker, says, "If the wicked are raised from the dead, it is in consequence of the power which Christ, as Redeemer, acquired over them, and of his right in them. . . .If they are not raised from the dead in consequence of Christ's right in them, acquired by purchase, it behooves those of a different opinion, *to show under what other constitution than that of the Gospel a resurrection. . . .is provided for.* The original law contains no intimation of this."—Theol. Inst. Vol. 2, p. 286.

Proposition L.

The salvation by Christ does not affect the unbeliever.

"God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth* in him may not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3: 16. "He that *believeth* on the Son

hath everlasting life ; but he that *believeth not* the Son shall *not see life ;* but the wrath of God *abideth* on him." John 3 : 36.

The "wrath" spoken of is wrought by the law on the natural man (Rom. 4 : 15) and if he refuses to have it removed by believing in Christ, it "abideth" *still.* "The Son quickeneth *whom he will.*" John 5 : 21. The implication is that he does not quicken *every one,* which is supported by the next verse, "For the Father judgeth *no man,* but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." That is, the Son judges in every case, and consequently quickens "whom he will."

"And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of LIFE : *he that cometh to me* shall never hunger ; and he that *believeth* on me shall never thirst." John 6 : 35. "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that *of all which he hath given me* I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, *and believeth on him,* may have everlasting life ; and *I will raise him up* at the last day." John 6 : 39, 40. "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Except ye eat* the flesh of the Son of man, *and drink* his blood, ye have *no life in you.* Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; and *I will raise him up* at the last day." John 6 : 53, 54. "And ye will not *come to me* that ye might have life." John 5 : 40. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father : so *he that eateth me,* even *he* shall live by me." John 6 : 57. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink, he *believing* on me. As the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which *they that believe* on him should receive : for the Holy Spirit was not yet manifested ; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." John 7 : 37–39. "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall *die in your sins.* . . .I said therefore unto you, that ye shall *die in your sins ;* for if ye *believe not* that I am he, ye shall *die in your sins.*" John 8 : 21, 24. "*Ye believe not,* because ye are *not of my sheep,* as I said unto you. *My sheep hear my voice,* and I know them, and *they follow me :* and I give unto them eternal life ; and they shall *never perish,* neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." John 10 : 26–28. "I am the resurrection, and the life : he that *believeth* in me, though he were dead, *yet shall he live :* and whosoever liveth and *believeth* in me shall never die." John 11 : 25–26. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. 19 : 16. "They which shall

be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead . . . . are the children of God, *being* the children of the resurrection." Luke 20 : 35, 36. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one *that believeth.* . . . As it is written, The just by faith *shall live.*" Rom. 1 : 16, 17.

We might continue, and quote many other texts, all giving the same undeviating testimony in favor of the proposition.—If no counter evidence can be presented, there is but one conclusion. It may be safely stated, that there is not a whisper of unconditional salvation in the *least* degree, throughout the Scriptures.

The common idea of an indiscriminate justification is glaringly erroneous, and is based on a wrong understanding of Rom. 5 : 12–21. The passage must not be wrested from its connection as is generally done. Paul's argument on justification extends from Rom. 3 : 21 unto Rom. 5 : 21. Whosoever masters that argument *cannot fail* to perceive that there is not a lisp of unconditional justification in it. The line is plainly drawn between the fleshly race of Adam under the condemnation of the law to death, and the spiritual race of Jesus Christ, the second Adam, who are justified by faith to life eternal. 1 Cor. 15 : 22, which is interpreted in favor of an unconditional salvation, is easily and readily explained in harmony with Rom. 5 : 15–21.

SEVENTH ARGUMENT

against the resurrection of the wicked.

As the resurrection is a provision of the plan of salvation through Christ (Prop. K), no person can have a resurrection unless they are affected by that plan. But the wicked are not affected by it (Prop. L).

Therefore THE WICKED CANNOT HAVE A RESURRECTION.

NOTE.—Here we rest our case. Other arguments might be offered, but they could not strengthen the position. If the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked is true, every one of these seven arguments can be overthrown. If they cannot be refuted, the doctrine must be rejected by every candid person who becomes acquainted with them. We challenge any person to refute any one of them. We are prepared to defend them against all comers, either in public debate or written discussion. We shall notice John 5 : 28, 29 in our next. Also Acts 24 : 15.

CHRIST'S COMING, NOT DEATH, THE GROUND OF CHRISTIAN WATCHFULNESS.

THE TESTIMONY OF A VALUABLE WITNESS.

JOSEPH A. SEISS, D.D., Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, published in March, 1862, a work on The Parable of the Ten Virgins. In the last of the Six Discourses devoted to that theme, the duty of watchfulness in view of the Lord's second appearing is impressively enforced, and the subject affords the author an opportunity to speak of Death in a style quite uncommon among Christian teachers of whose faith the immortality of the soul is a corner stone. The following extract cannot fail to interest our readers, and we commend it especially to the serious attention of all devout minds who would have "the motive powers of Christian piety" exhibited in all the strength and loveliness of their primitive, New Testament integrity.

RUFUS WENDELL.

EXTRACT FROM DR. SEISS'S WORK.

It has come to be the fashion in modern Christianity to adopt a very different strain of exhortation on this subject. It is seldom that preachers are heard urging on their people to watch for the coming of the Son of man. Death is the event to which men are referred, in connection with these passages, as to all intents and purposes the coming of Christ, at least to the individual. And there are some points in which the two concur.—It is where death leaves a man that the coming of the Saviour will find him. Nor is it unscriptural, in general discourse, to overleap the interval altogether, and to ply the conscience with the admonitions of all the gospel the same as if the moment of death brought with it all the great transactions of the last day. But it is a mistake, and one fraught with much practical mischief, to treat of death as if that were the thing to be looked to, and of which to interpret the many solemn injunctions of Scripture with reference to the coming again of Christ. It is proper enough to swallow up death in the scenes of the great day; but it is wholly unwarrantable to allow the scenes of that day to be swallowed up in our contemplations of death. Death, whether

in itself or in its immediate consequences, is altogether a different thing from the coming of Christ. Nor is it at all fitted to take the place in our thoughts and exhortations which belongs to the coming of the Son of man. It has less attractiveness; it is weaker in practical impressiveness; and it presents a narrower, darker, more legal, and less evangelical circle of ideas. And to put it forward in our contemplations instead of the prospect of the personal coming of the Lord Jesus, is to put a gloss upon the Scriptures which they were never intended to wear, to foist our judgment into the place of Divine wisdom, and to destroy one of the most beautiful collections of sacred truth.

It is not enough, my friends, that we may embrace all the doctrines of christianity in our creed. We must at the same time receive them in their proper order and revealed connections. We cannot take the precepts and representations which are given in connection with the coming of Christ, and apply them all to death, and then say that we believe in the coming of the Son of man as the Scriptures present that doctrine. Proper submission to the authority of revelation requires us to receive its teachings in the connections in which God's word places them. And when we are told to watch for the coming of the Son of man, to apply the exhortation to death, and at the same time to put away the subject of the personal advent among articles of no direct practical concern, is to put asunder what God hath joined together, and to undertake to adjust the relations of Divine truth in a way which he has not authorized.

So far from making death the great terminus, the generalizations under which the gospel views things quite overlook it. Starting with the first advent, the prospect stretches uninterruptedly anward to the second. The Christian Church is contemplated as one, unmutilated, ever-continuing, until Christ himself comes, and grace ends in glory. Death is not known in the case, and never once appears upon the whole length of the way, except as, here and there, a shadow, which hinders nothing and to which no attention is paid. Looking at some of the most vigorous and precious passages in which we find the whole course of Christianity surveyed, it would be impossible to learn from them alone that death had any existence. Take this from Hebrews:—"Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin, unto salvation." Death and judgment are referred to in immediate proximity with these words, but only in connection with the course of sin; whilst the course of the Christian is made to reach back to Christ on the cross, in which it takes its rise, and forward to his coming again in the glory of the Father,

in which it reaches its goal, with nothing coming between but the life of faith and hope. Take also this, from the Epistle to Titus:—"The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, *even* the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Here, again, death is quite ignored, and the present world is made to touch directly upon the scenes of the appearing again of Christ, as the great and only event to which the Christian looks, next after his apprehension of Jesus as his Saviour. Two *appearings* are spoken of,—the one looked back to, as *bringing* salvation, the other directly anticipated, as the completion of it. The one is *grace*, the other, *glory*. By conforming to the proposals brought to us in the first, we hopefully await the second. And between these two, Christian life is sustained, with nothing more to separate it from the object of its anticipations in the future than from the object of its faith in the past. It is, therefore, a sad disjointing of the scriptural adjustments of sacred truth, and an attempt to construct and sustain Christian life upon foundations and supports somewhat other than those appointed, to thrust death in as one of the great themes of evangelical incentive, or as a prominent subject in evangelical contemplations of the future. Death belongs to sin and the curse, not to the gospel and salvation; and no one can substitute it, in any respect or degree, for "that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," without damage to true evangelism, and great weakening in the motive-powers of Christian piety.

And, for this very reason, preaching about death, which is usually accepted as the most pathetic, is generally the most ineffective and useless of all. It is a dislocation of the Divine order. It inserts into the gospel a point of appeal different from that which it contains. And on the side of the future it gives to Christianity an artificial contrivance on which to go, in place of the elastic and powerful limb of living bone and muscle given it of God. (pp. 131–135.)

In connection with the concluding paragraph of the foregoing extract Dr. Seiss has a foot-note of some significance. We copy it entire:—

"It is fresh in the memories of some of you," says Rev. Wm. Newton, in his "Lectures on Daniel," (p. 213,) "how, a short time ago, a faithful and honored minister of Christ, of large experience in his Master's work, declared in this pulpit that he was never conscious of making 'so little headway in proclaiming the truth as when death, and the certainty of death, was his theme.'

"Riding out to attend a funeral some time since, with a minister of another denomination by my side, I said to him, 'Is there any one theme in handling which you feel that you are making less impression on your hearers than with almost any other?' He paused a few moments, and replied, 'I think there is.' 'And what is it?' 'Why,' said he, 'it is very strange,—I don't exactly understand it,—but *I seem never to be so unsuccessful as when I preach about death!*'"

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

From the Army.—The Examiner and other works were received.—They were a feast of fat things to us all. Your kind letter was read by many of the soldiers, and duly appreciated; many having learned of you and your faith in the Life-giver. A fellow soldier (a Methodist for years) has read some of the Examiners, and from a careful reading of the Bible and your magazine he has come to the conclusion *death* is the wages of sin; and that unless he takes hold of the *Life-giver* by faith, the penalty of the law will be enforced on him, and a revival into life from that death will be impossible. Thus you see, there is a chance, even here in the army, to advance in the truth of God. Many others are looking at these things. As regards a change in the Examiner—we wish no change of Editor, nor in the time of its issue. We should be glad to receive it semi-monthly, and still more so to receive it weekly, but think it better well supported monthly than to burden you with a more frequent issue, and not give you the needed pecuniary aid. If our portion is $10 we will gladly pay it.

10th Army Corps, *Beaufort, S. C.* C.

—

R. V. Lyon, writing from Whitby, C. W., says:—I am deeply interested in the Examiner. I shall endeavor to extend its circulation. For the encouragement of the friends of truth, allow me to say, *Bible truth* is progressing in this country, also in western N. Y., where I have labored. Since my note in the Examiner, dated July 17, I have immersed 21 souls into the Christ for the remission of sins, and am still in pursuit of some lost sheep.

—

Eld. John Craig, Clinton, Mass., writes:—I am grateful to God and thankful to you for the light given me by the Examiner. It is plain the wicked have no claim to life, whatever, when they have rejected the Life-giver. Death is the penalty for sin, and death they receive; and having received their wages they get no more: there God's threatening ends.

I prize the EXAMINER above every other work except my Bible ; and both agree so well, that reading first one and then the other seems like reading the same thing twice. I wish it could come every week ; but thank the Lord for it once a month.

One of my sons has come home from the army with the loss of his right arm. I have two more there. What will be their fate I know not. Prayers and tears are all I can help them with now. Pray for me.

—

B. K. DAVIS, Monroe, Me., writes :—About one year ago my mind was first called to the subject of no future life to the wicked. Since then I have diligently and prayerfully studied the Bible, but was not settled on the question till I read "Retribution," which a friend gave me to clear my mind of error, as he supposed. I must say it did ; for I can now say, to me it is clear that whoever gets life from the dead, will die no more. If "Retribution" proves anything, it proves eternal torment. It is a little more than a year since I commenced preaching. Sunday, Nov. 16th, by the help and blessing of God, I raised the *new* banner ; and when the gales of grace shook out its blessed folds we saw inscribed, in letters of living light, "No LIFE OUT OF CHRIST :" and I must say, I never had such liberty before. God gave a rich blessing truly. To Him be the praise : bless His holy name.

—

G. B. MARTIN writes from Wright Co., Iowa :—It is a long time since I have heard from you. I emigrated from Penn. to this place in 1858. I have never heard a sermon since I came here : but I have my good old Bible, and I read it daily. I am still looking for the glorious return of the Saviour to this earth to reign with all His saints, and I think the coming nigh, even at the door. It seems to me the prophecy of Micah is fulfilling, "And He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off." This land is far off from Jerusalem where the Gospel first began ; and I think it possible that prophecy points to the present calamities in our country.***I would be glad to hear from you. I know not where you are living, or whether living at all or not. I took the EXAMINER from about its commencement till it was suspended at the close of 1857. I have some of your works. I consider your "SIX SERMONS" the best work ever written : they confirmed me in the view, "all the wicked shall God destroy." May God reward your labors, and bring you safely to His kingdom.

—

E. WOLCOTT, Oceanport, N. J., writes :—At Herbertsville, where you preached last August, persecution rages against the little flock ; but there is manifest, thus far, an old-fashioned constancy. I trust, by the power of God, the enemy will never be able to root up the vine planted there.

—

Eld. J. WHITTLESEY, Salem, Conn., writes :—The doctrines advanced

by the BIBLE EXAMINER are so in accordance with the word of God, I am led to wonder they should not be embraced by all who take the Bible as the guide and rule of life. The doctrine of life only through Christ appears so perfectly to harmonize with the sacred volume, that I delight to dwell upon it. I have searched the Scriptures prayerfully to ascertain the truth, which I prize more than fine gold. Your teachings throw a light on the word of God which inspires my heart with sacred joy. It represents God as just and merciful, and no tyrant ; and the Saviour all-sufficient ; hence I delight to read the Bible Examiner. May God prosper your efforts to enlighten and benefit men.

—

MRS. L. D. HEATH, Orleans Co., N. Y., writes :—I shall be exceedingly glad to see the EXAMINER *weekly*, and shall take it, let the price be what it may. It is just what the cause at this time demands. I love the ways of the Lord. I never saw such *perfection* of wisdom and beauty as since I saw the light on the non-revival of the wicked dead. It gives light on many portions of Scripture that were dark before, and harmonizes those that seemed in conflict. I am thankful I ever saw the light. "LIFE FROM THE DEAD" was the work that first gave me light. It is cheering to see so many coming out clear and strong on the truth.

—

LEVI BOUGHTON, Ontario Co., writes :—I am glad the EXAMINER is likely to be sustained. It is the only periodical in the world, so far as I know, that makes CHRIST the *only* source of life to man. All others retain some of the old theological feeling of revenge on the wicked, by giving life to them for the sake of torment and another death.—With my faith in GOD, I feel exceedingly happy, and rest in our dear Saviour alone for immortal life. I am anxious to see an article from you as to what is to come out of the present war in our country.

—

D. EDSON SMITH, Onondaga Co., writes :—An intelligent man with whom I conversed on the life theme, said, on the old theory, the Bible seemed unmeaning, and a confused mass, so that he had ceased, for twenty years, to take an interest in it ; but the way I talk of it, it seemed a new book. In a public debate I had with a Cambellite, on the state of the dead, this man came ten miles to hear. He became deeply interested. I gave him some of your works ; and now, thank the Lord, he is seeking as for hid treasure. His whole mind seems absorbed in the question, "What shall be the end of them who obey not the gospel" ?

—

HELEN ROBERTSON, Utica, writes :—How that name, "LIFE-GIVER," fills my heart ! I love to *rest* my eye on it and think of the Blessed One whose it is, and think of the time when He will bestow "the gift." In conversation with a lady, I opened my view to her from the Scriptures of "No life out of Christ." Her husband is a student of geology, astronomy, and other sciences ; and she told me, he saw

such a God of love in all these things, he could not believe in eternal torment: and therefore almost rejected revelation, because the Methodists had taught him, that was the most prominent doctrine of the Bible. I gave her your "Six Sermons." I called on them again and found they were both searchers after truth. He said, the idea he got of God from the Methodists was, that He was always at the sinner's heels, with a pan of hot coals driving him to heaven. He found the God of Nature a different being, and therefore *must* reject the God of revelation. They were reading the Sermons, and much interested.—A few evenings after, the wife came to me rejoicing. O, how happy she was! She said, she never had anything that did her so much good; and that her husband was being drawn to the God of the Bible through the power, reasonableness, and straight forwardness of the reasoning of the Sermons. She said, "It will save us *both* from infidelity; for he [her husband] showed me things in such a light that I *too* was turning away from the Bible." O, bless the Lord, bless His holy name, that the God of the Bible is a *God of love*. This lady is willing that every body should know her change of views: her interest in the Bible is intense. O, what a Bible that is; and when we take hold of it right, how easy to be understood!

—

RUFUS WENDELL, Salem, Mass., writes:—The Discussion with Eld. Gates has awakened a new interest here on the Life theme, and the good results are quite apparent in various quarters. We debated seven evenings, and closed on Sunday night. Thirteen half-hour speeches were made by each of us—the closing speech each evening falling to me. I planted myself firmly upon the position that there is no future life for the wicked dead. Let those who wish to combat eternal misery, universalism, and spiritualism, without this weapon do so—*I cannot*. The Lord is opening the way for the spread of the Truth of Life only in Christ, and to His name be all the praise. Be it ours to labor faithfully.

Let me add that the Debate between Eld. Gates and myself was held in the Endicott-St. (Advent) Church, of which Dr. Josiah Litch is Pastor. The attendance throughout was good.

PEACE!

THE *Millennial Harbinger* makes great pretensions of peace. It has such an abhorrence of war that it cannot contain itself in the presence of any Christian who does not agree with it on the subject. The EXAMINER has unfortunately offended this Peaceable periodical by inserting some matter on the War Question. Hear it; it says:

"The *Examiner*, we think, has departed widely from the '*object*' of its publication, as expressed by its proprietor; and can but do itself *harm* by interfering with a matter that was none of its business, and withal to contain such vile slang."

The Good Book says, "Grievous words stir up anger;" but the *Harbinger* evidently thinks that they stir up *peace*. The EXAMINER expressed its approval of a western newspaper movement. At this the *Peaceable* Harbinger cries out—

"We should judge by the *Examiner* that this paper is intended to be a *warrior*."

For myself I am for *peace*. I do not believe that it is right to take up carnal weapons. But I am just as firmly opposed to that class of men who sow the *seeds* of *war* under the white flag of *peace*. Which is worse, to *conscientiously* bear arms, or to "*breathe out* threatenings and slaughter?" "Blessed are the peace-*makers*.

JOSEPH T. CURRY.

"WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THIS WAR?"—So inquire some. Our *opinion* is, It will end when *slavery does*, and not before; whether that is before the second advent of Christ, or not till after. We fully believe, it is the *nation's* "day of judgment;" and repentance or destruction will terminate the war. We wait to see events before saying more on the subject. This war may be the opening of the great drama that is to wind up this age, or dispensation: but we choose to withhold a *positive* expression on the subject till more light appears.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER has been somewhat delayed in its issue, by the absence of the Editor, and also to give the most time possible for old subscribers to renew, and new ones to come in. We thank the friends for the responses received. In addition to subscriptions, there have been *donations* from $1 up to $20. Some of these have been for the EXAMINER, and some for its EDITOR. May the LORD reward all such with grace and glory.

We thought of issing *semi*-monthly; but the increase in the price of paper forbids it, at present, unless a great increase of subscribers can be added to our list, or donations should warrant it.

BIBLE EXAMINER TRACTS.

It is proposed to publish a number of Tracts taken from the pages of the Examiner, entitled "*Bible Examiner Tracts.*" But they cannot be issued without funds. Will those favoring the object, supply the amount necessary? If so, we will put to press, at an early day, the following works: *viz*,—

No. 1. "Letter to a Clergyman; or, *Life only through Christ not a heresy:*" by Dr. J. K. Finley, Pittsburg, Pa. Price 5 cents.
No. 2. "The Wages of Sin; or, *The first Penalty, explained and confirmed by Scripture:*" by a Clergyman of an Orthodox Church. Price, 5 cents.
No. 3. "The Soul Saved or Lost:" by Geo. Storrs. Price, 5 cents.
No. 4. "The Doom of the Ungodly: or, *The wicked dead remain eternally under death's dominion:*" by Geo. Storrs. Price, 5 cents.
No. 5. "The Judgment:" by Geo. Storrs. Price, 5 cents.
No. 6. "Earth—not Heaven, is to be the Inheritance of the Saints:" by Geo. Storrs. Price 5 cents.
No. 7. "Moral Depravity:" by Geo. Storrs. Price 5 cents.
No. 8. "The Essential Baptism:" by Geo. Storrs. Price 7 cents.

To this list others will be added. No. 8 is already issued.—No. 1 has been issued, but the edition was long since exhausted; and if more are desired we must have funds to print them. The other six numbers have never been issued in *Tract* form. The donor may designate, if he chooses, to the printing of which Nos. he will have his donation applied.

The postage on the foregoing Tracts will be *one* cent each, unless sent in packages of 8 ozs. or over: then it will be a *half* cent per ounce.

—

Eld. A. Guthrie, Tompkins Co., N. Y., writes:—I would recommend to every friend of the Examiner to send and get a few copies of the "Extra" on the "*Essential Baptism*" and circulate in their localities, that it may help to hold in check or cure the spirit of intolerance that is becoming so rampant in some sections of the land.

—

Note by the Editor.—We are glad to insert the foregoing recommendation, and trust it will not be unheeded. Soon the proud waves of intolerance will have swept away the last vestige of "brotherly love" if its waters are not checked. We can supply the "*Extra*" to any extent. Let it have wings.—Price 7 cents single: $4 per 100, sent in that case at the expense of the purchaser.

FEBRUARY.

Vol. XV. PUBLISHED MONTHLY. 1863.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES."—Jesus.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR.

TERMS:
One Dollar per Vol. of 384 Pages. Single Numbers, of 32 Pages, 15 Cts.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR:
POST OFFICE ADDRESS, BOX 4059,
NEW-YORK.

Contents of the February Number.

1. "WILL THERE BE A RESURRECTION OF WICKED MEN?" By Joseph T. Curry,..... 33
2. THE CONDITION OF EUROPE,..... 40
3. A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN RUFUS WENDELL & MILES GRANT,..... 41
4. THE JUDGMENT. By the Editor,..... 51
5. "RETRIBUTION,"..... 52
6. AN ARMY DIALOGUE,..... 53
7. A CATECHISM FOR THE TIMES,..... 54
8. THE MIRROR. By O. R. L. Crozier,..... 55
9. THE DIFFERENCE. By T. P. Lewis,..... 57
10. LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS,..... 59
11. THE BIBLE EXAMINER,..... 64

REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS TO EXAMINER.

RUFUS WENDELL, *Salem*, Mass
JOSEPH T, CURRY. *Springfield*, Mass.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"THIS IS THE RECORD, THAT GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, AND THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON. HE THAT HATH THE SON, HATH LIFE; AND HE THAT HATH NOT THE SON, HATH NOT LIFE."

Vol. 15. No. 2.] **FEBRUARY, 1863.** [Whole No. 221.

"WILL THERE BE A RESURRECTION OF WICKED MEN?"

A NOTICE BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THE above question furnishes the topic for a series of articles lately published in the *Gospel Banner*, Geneva, Ill. We do not esteem them of sufficient weight to merit a formal review, but propose to glance at certain portions of the argument, which, by their weakness and inconsistency, serve to illustrate the futility of the opposition to the doctrine of "*Life only in Christ.*"

The writer begins by taking a middle ground between the theory of the resurrection of *all* the wicked and that of *no* resurrection of the wicked. He says,

> "Though the word of God does not teach the resurrection of *all* the wicked, yet it does a resurrection of part—all those that have not already been judged and knowingly condemned to die for their sins."

As belonging to the number who are not raised, he refers to that portion of the Antediluvian world which experienced death by the flood, the Sodomites, and the families of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. He says,

> "Being 'over much wicked,' God judged them unworthy of life, and condemned them to death. . . . . In view of similar judgments, Solomon says, 'Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish; why shouldest thou die *before thy time?*' Eccl. 7 : 17. . . I can come then to no other conclusion in the face of such evidence, but that some being over much wicked have suffered the penalty of the law—died the 'Second Death'; therefore will not appear in the general judgment."

We must acknowledge the decided originality of the writer. *We* should not have dreamed of having the *over much* wicked

suffer *one* death and the common order of sinners *two* deaths. *Our* arrangement would have been *vice versa*. We pass on to another point. Our readers will be surprised when they learn that John 3 : 36 ; 6 : 48, 50, 58 ; Rom. 8 : 13, "with many others of the same class" are *not applicable* "to the *present* age." The following is the argument.

"It is quite impossible that such passages can have a strict or complete fulfillment under the present constitution of things; where die both the righteous and the wicked—he that partaketh of Christ and he that partaketh not—he that liveth after the flesh and he that mortifieth the deeds of the body, all die—all alike are laid in the dust. It is equally impossible to apply the truth they teach to the present age without changing the order of the plan of God." "But when applied to the world to come, where the antitypical 'Tree of Life,' and true 'Bread of Life' actually exist—and the world can have access thereto: then shall not only those who fail to partake of the same, die and not rise; but on the other hand, those who do partake shall never die. Then shall a 'non-resurrection of the wicked' be no longer a *theory* but truth. Then shall the following passages be strictly and truly fulfilled, with many others of the same class. 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.' John 3: 36. 'I am that bread of life.' 'This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*.' 'This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead; *he that eateth of this bread* SHALL *live forever*.' John 6: 48, 50, 58."

If we comprehend the writer's meaning, he holds that there is no *vital* connection between Christ and the believer in *this* life. The resurrection does not develop the result of something *commenced here*. There is no such thing as a quickening process in *this* world of which the believer's resurrection is the inevitable consequence. When Christ said, "*I am* the bread of life," he did not mean "that a man may eat thereof,' in *this* state of existence. The *eating* is to take place in "the world *to come*." Then Paul's talk about "the *earnest* of the Spirit," does not mean that we have a *pledge* of future redemption.—We have not, then, been "*sealed* with the *Holy Spirit* of promise." All we have is the naked *promise*.

Here we have the sad and yet legitimate effect of the exceedingly aquatic theory held by that class to which our writer belongs. The Spirit's office and influence are ignored by them. Immersed in the *symbol* they reject the *substance*. Pronouncing "experimental religion a strong delusion" they seek to supply

the lack by "divers baptisms"—*diaphorois baptismois*—"carnal ordinances" (Heb. 9 : 10). Alas! that men should hew "them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water" and forsake "the fountain of *living* waters." "As the Scripture hath said, Out of His belly (*i. e.*, out of Christ) shall flow rivers of *living* water. But this spake He of THE SPIRIT which they that believe on Him should receive." Let us for a moment turn from such a lamentable theory and consider our Lord's language in John 6th chapter.

"Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you." Work not, *when?* In the next age?—Nay, but *now* we are to prefer the "meat" given by "the Son of man" to "our necessary food." Well, if we work for "that meat" *now*, shall we not obtain it *now?* Yea! *Now* we may feed on "that meat which *endureth*."

"And Jesus said unto them, *I am* the bread of life: he that *cometh to me* shall never hunger; and he that *believeth on me* shall never thirst." The Spirit given by Jesus constitutes the believer's enduring and all-sufficient portion *in this life*. It is "*in him* a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

"And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which *He hath given me* I should *lose nothing*, but should *raise it up again* at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life: and *I will raise him up at the last day*." Thus, the resurrection "at the last day" is a *consequence* of *belief* in this life. Over all such Christ exercises a *preserving* power through *the Spirit* which He gives them, so that they shall "not perish," they shall not be *lost* in death, but will be raised up "at the last day."

"I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and ARE DEAD. *This* is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*."—Unless "a man" partakes of "this bread" *in the present life* he will certainly perish *in death*, "in *his own* corruption." But if he eats "thereof," he obtains a life-principle *here* which will preserve him from *extinction*, and the resurrection "day" will prove that he did "*not die*."

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you,

Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you.*" This passage proves beyond all doubt that the believer gets hold of the "*life*" in *this* world, and the *consequential event* follows. "Whoso *eateth* my flesh, and *drinketh* my blood, *hath* eternal life; and I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY."

"He that *eateth* my flesh, and *drinketh* my blood, *dwelleth* in *me*, and I in HIM." Here again the sense is unmistakable; the eating and the dwelling go together, and *this* world is the scene. Again comes the *result*. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so *he* that *eateth* me, even HE shall live BY ME." Here belongs the parallel text John 14: 17.—"*Because* I live, *ye* shall live also." And just here Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 15 ch. applies. *Christ's* resurrection necessitates that of *all* those who dwell IN HIM, just as certainly as *Adam's* death necessitates the death of *all in him*. "As *in Adam* all die, even so *in Christ* shall all be made alive."

Our Lord fitly concludes the subject with the luminous and comprehensive declaration, "It is THE SPIRIT that QUICKENETH; the flesh profiteth nothing."

Further on, our writer says,

"We are plainly told that at the winding up of the present constitution of things there shall be a resurrection of the dead: but it is not so easy a matter to make a promised resurrection of the dead, apply only to the righteous."

If the writer will trouble himself so far as to refer to our "First Argument against the resurrection of the wicked," with the accompanying discussion, found in the September EXAMINER, he may see cause to alter his ideas of the "*promised* resurrection." How those who are not "heirs of the promise" can have the *benefit* of it, is yet to be explained. He says,

"Therefore, I say, let them prove that to live again—revive from the dead—necessitates an immortal, an incorruptible nature, and the point is gained that the righteous only will live again. But this cannot be done; for the recorded facts of revelation prove that such is not the case. . . . The son of the Shunamite woman—the widows' sons at Sarepta and Nain—the man who was let down upon the bones of Elisha—the daughter of Jairus—Lazarus, and others, were raised to life by the power of God: but not one obtained eternal or future life. We are also told that Christ gave the Apostles power to raise the dead: but who will presume to say that he gave them power to give eternal life."

Let us have our writer's challenge fairly understood before we reply, "Let them prove that to live again—revive from the dead"—"at the winding up of the present constitution of things"—"necessitates an immortal, an incorruptible nature." If this presentation does not suit our writer it is not our fault; it is the *true* question at issue according to his own statement as laid down in the two extracts. We wish it clearly understood that what God has done in the past by the way of miracles has nothing to do with His future developments. The "recorded facts" alluded to do not affect the doctrine of "the resurrection of *the dead*." We now reply to the challenge.

Paul says, 1 Cor. 15, "So also is *the resurrection of the dead*. It is sown in corruption; it *is raised* in INCORRUPTION. . . . It is raised a SPIRITUAL BODY. . . *The dead* shall be raised INCORRUPTIBLE." Thus Paul gives *the law* of the resurrection "at the winding up of the present constitution of things;" and we defy the writer to prove that a single person will have part in the resurrection at Christ's coming, or *thereafter*, except in accordance with *this* law.

The "recorded facts" mentioned are not at all apposite to this discussion. In not one instance had the subject experienced the weight of the penalty which is appointed to the animal man. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," was the sentence which involves not merely death, but *dissolution, corruption, non-existence*. We confess that the resurrection of beings after their identity is lost appears to us impossible. The Almighty must accomplish His *ends* by using *means;* and we believe that the only instituted means to preserve from annihilation in the state of corruption which is entered at death, is *the Spirit* of God. Those who have not that Spirit "*utterly perish* in *their own* corruption" as certainly as "irrational brute beasts." *There is not an instance on record* of the revival from *corruption* of an animal being, "having not the Spirit;" and we verily believe there *never will be* an instance. And it is a question in our mind whether *any* person was ever restored to *animal* life after having seen corruption. Yet we well understand that such a thing might take place in any case where the identity has been preserved by *the Spirit*. For instance, if Moses was resurrected to animal life, to appear on the mount at the transfiguration, the work was accomplished by the Spirit; although its normal operation effects *spiritual* life.

Our writer uses some arguments which have been answered in the EXAMINER: for instance, that which is based on the rendering *turned back* in Ps. 9: 17. He quotes Prof. Hudson in "Debt and Grace" to the effect that the original word "always denotes a return or turning back to a former place or state."—The statement is incorrect, and has been qualified in the *Crisis* by the Professor. Even if *turned back* is the proper rendering in the text the supposed conclusion is wrong, for the Psalm clearly refers to the *living* wicked at the coming of Christ, as has been shown in the EXAMINER.

Some of the writer's views are strikingly original, but we cannot waste space to present them. We have noticed a specimen at the beginning of this article. It is not necessary to answer every ephemeral argument that appears in print; and for ourselves, we are perfectly willing that the *Banner* articles should be published in a pamphlet, according to the design of the writer. Time will sift the chaffy material to the winds, and he will awake some morning *minus* his "strong reasons." There is one sentiment, however, which we will consider in conclusion, because it is generally held by our opponents, and is radically erroneous. It is contained in the following passage.

"But, says one, the sentence of death has already been executed upon the wicked, and in death shall they remain. Not so fast, friend; for the righteous die the same death, and from the same cause; now if it be the *just* penalty of the *law*, then the righteous have fallen under the penalty, which cannot be *justly* set aside; hence, they also cannot be raised. Such I claim is a legitimate conclusion arrived at from the premises laid down. But the premises are wrong; the death which the sinner and the righteous now die is not for their *own* transgressions; but for *Adam's;* which they were by him subjected to without any transgression on their part. Therefore all may be redeemed therefrom to stand or fall for themselves."

Here we have the assumption that some are *righteous* in the sight of the *law*. "All" are "to stand or fall for themselves," says this writer. Then some are righteous or they cannot "stand." How opposed is this sentiment to the teaching of Scripture! Paul says, "By deeds of *law* there shall *no flesh* be *justified* in his sight: for by law is the knowledge of *sin*." "For *all* have *sinned*, and come short of the glory of God." "For I was alive without law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." "I am carnal, sold under sin." "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing." "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom. 3: 20, 23; 7: 9, 10, 14, 18; 8: 7, 8. "But that no man is justified by law in the sight of God is evident." "The Scripture hath concluded *all* under *sin*." Gal. 3: 11, 22.

Thus our writer and those who reason like him are entirely in the dark with respect to the condition of the natural man. The animal race are already condemned as *sinners*, and to say that *any* are *righteous* involves a contradiction of God's word. Now suppose we allow that "the death which" men "now die is not for their own transgressions" and that "all may be redeemed therefrom to stand or fall for themselves." What follows? Plainly, that *all* men will have to die *after* this supposed redemption. All must "*fall* for themselves" for none can "stand," inasmuch as *all* are condemned by the law. Thus nothing is gained by saying that men do not *now* die for their own transgressions. The trouble is only shifted into the *next* age; a very convenient method, by the way, to get rid of a difficulty.

But what do the Scriptures mean when they apply the term *righteous?* They refer to the righteousness of faith. "The just by *faith* shall *live*." And who are the wicked? The *unbelieving*. We now indorse the remark of our writer: "The righteous die the same death, and from the same cause; now if it be the *just* penalty of the *law*, then the righteous have fallen under the penalty, which cannot be *justly* set aside."—Now follows his conclusion which we do *not* indorse: "Hence, they also cannot be raised. Such I claim is the legitimate conclusion from the premises." "Such," we admit, "is the legitimate conclusion," if the law *only* is considered. But just here *Christ* steps in, and says, "*I* am come that ye may have *life*."—And this life is the consequence not of the righteousness of the law but of the justification through *faith* in the LIFE-GIVER.—The great mistake made by our writer consists in his attempt to get *life* from the *law;* whereas Paul says, "If there had been a *law* given which could have given *life*, verily *righteousness* should have been by *law*. But the Scripture hath concluded *all* under *sin*, that the *promise* by *faith* of JESUS CHRIST might

be given to THEM THAT BELIEVE." If the query now arises in our author's mind, "How can God *justly* give a future life to them that are condemned to eternal death? he has arrived at the point where he will perceive the wisdom and love of God in sending a *spiritual* nature into the world, not under condemnation; "that He might be *just*" in giving the *law* its claim, and yet "the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus" by giving him the spiritual nature. And here the essential baptism comes in, without which there is no future life. "That which is begotten of the flesh is *flesh*; and that which is begotten of THE SPIRIT is SPIRIT."

THE CONDITION OF EUROPE.—"To even a casual observer it is apparent that Europe is gradually but surely drifting into a convulsion. Notwithstanding that respective European Governments profess to be at amity with all neighboring powers, that emperors, kings, and diplomists are studiously polite to one another, and that professions of friendship are on their lips, there is much reason to fear that they mutually distrust one another, and are quietly preparing for the storm which is believed to be impending. Everywhere a spirit of uneasiness seems to pervade Europe. Russia, for instance, would appear to be on the verge of a revolution which may burst forth at any moment. General dissatisfaction is felt in the army, on which the Czar solely relies. A vast conspiracy exists, not only among the soldiery, but among the officers. A secret society, something after the principle of Ribbonism in Ireland, appears to have been formed; and when the work of assassination is decided upon, parties are elected to carry out the sentence of the tribunal. The nobles and the middle class population are also disaffected, and the numerous incendiary fires in all parts of the kingdom indicate how widely the conspiracy has spread. Poland shows unmistakable signs that ere long it will be in a state of convulsion; indeed, actual revolution is only kept down by martial law and the presence of a large army. With these internal sources of disquiet existing in his empire, the Czar has thought it a favorable opportunity to enter into a treaty (it is said of a very intimate character) with France and Italy —a combination that looks ominous for the future peace of Europe, and especially threatening to England."—*London Observer.*

A CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN RUFUS WENDELL AND MILES GRANT

RELATIVE TO

A Public Oral Debate in Boston on the Relation of the Wicked Dead to a Future Life.

LETTER NO. 1.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Mass., December 16, 1862.

Dear Bro. Grant:—Repeatedly during the past year, as you are aware, have I intimated a desire to meet you in public oral debate on the question of difference between us respecting the relation of the wicked dead to a future life. If my memory serves me correctly, when the matter was first mentioned to you (last winter), you expressed a willingness to discuss the subject. More recently, however, you have suggested that it might appear strange to "outsiders" to see "ministers of the same denomination" engaged in controversy. This consideration, however, appears to me to have little or no weight. That *you* should attach no importance to it appears clearly enough from the fact that you have not refrained from proclaiming throughout our "denomination," in the paper over which you preside, a most emphatic and unqualified commendation of "Retribution." More than all this, you avail yourself of your editorial prerogative to exclude from the *Crisis* the arguments of those of your brethren who repudiate as unscriptural the "great truth" which *you* say is demonstrated with entire conclusiveness in the work just named. These circumstances (with others which might be referred to) render it quite appropriate that you should shrink not from the defense of the views you hold on this question, if you deem yourself competent to maintain them in debate; and the object of this note is to give you a formal invitation to discuss the subject with me, on successive evenings, in Chapman Hall, Boston, and inquire whether you are willing to do so. If you accede to my proposal, we can readily fix upon the form of the question (or questions) and any other needful preliminaries.

I would suggest that it would require ten evenings to do the subject tolerable justice. We might stipulate to debate that number of evenings unless during the progress of the discussion we should mutually agree to bring it to a conclusion in less time.

As to the *time* for holding the discussion, I would name Monday evening, January 5th (*prox.*), and onward—suspending it, of course, on Saturday and Sunday evenings.

The place (lower or upper Hall, as the case may require) has been tendered us by the Chapman Hall brethren, and if we debate you shall be subjected to no pecuniary responsibility.

I should not object to an earlier time than that above named, if you should prefer not to wait till then, though I am of opinion that it would be unwise to mix up the discussion with the approaching holidays.

Many of our friends in Boston (on your side of the question and on mine) would be pleased with, and interested in, such a debate as I here propose. Let us, then, gratify them, and trust that our labor, if performed from right motives and in the spirit of meekness and love, will be blessed of God to the furtherance of His precious truth.

Do me the favor to return an answer to the foregoing (by mail) as soon as you have reached a decision.

Yours affectionately, in the Lord, RUFUS WENDELL.

P. S.—This will go unsealed to Bro. Meservey as I wish him to see it before it is handed to you. I shall give him permission to take a copy of it if he cares to do so. RUFUS.

LETTER No. 2.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 17th, 1862.

DEAR BRO. WENDELL:—Yours of the 16th inst. is at hand.

If you are satisfied it is for the glory of the Lord that we should have a discussion in Boston, on the resurrection of the wicked dead, I will consent to debate the subject with you at the time and place named, (Jan. 5th, Chapman Hall) provided we can agree on the form of the question, and other preliminaries. I would propose the following question :—"*Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?*" I would suggest that we speak twenty minutes at a time—two hours each evening, for four or five sessions. I think there is no need of being *ten* evenings about it. Let us condense, and come to the pith of the matter.

Please write me by return mail, as I am to be off on Saturday, expecting to be gone some days.

Love to the "loved ones at home." Your Bro. in Christ,

MILES GRANT.

LETTER No. 3.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Friday Evening, Dec. 19, 1862.

Dear Miles:—I was at Lynn this afternoon ; on my return this evening your favor of the 17th (mailed *to-day*) was handed me. In replying without any delay, I have to say,—

1. I am persuaded that the cause of Truth would be promoted by such a Discussion as I have proposed, and in this way I think "the glory of the Lord" would be subserved.

2. I approve of your suggestion that we debate two hours each evening, and that our speeches be twenty minutes in length.

3. You suggest "four or five sessions" for the Debate, and "think there is no need of being *ten* evenings about it." In answer to this, I would say that we ought not to engage in such a Discussion unless we are willing to go over the entire ground to the extent of our acquaintance with the subject. Not only so, but our aim should be to carry conviction to the minds of our auditors, and this result I need hardly tell you would not be best attained by merely giving "the pith of the matter." Of course, our purpose should be to bring out the *pith*, but we should also expect to dwell upon our points sufficiently to render it probable that they are generally comprehended, and their bearings appreciated, by our hearers. Now while I am quite sensible of my inability to do full justice to my side of the question, I am certain that what I am conscious of being able to offer to the purpose, in the way of direct arguments against your view and in answer to those which I have reason to believe you would bring to its support, could not be said in "four or five" hours. I remain of the opinion that we should stipulate to discuss ten evenings, subject to any curtailment in the number of sessions which we might both consent to after we have entered upon our work. *I* should certainly have no desire to prolong the Discussion needlessly, but it appears to me improper to begin it at all if at the outset it is known by either of the disputants that the sessions agreed upon are too few in number to do tolerable justice to the subject. If you are unwilling to discuss in two consecutive weeks, I propose that we begin on Jan. 5th and debate five evenings in succession, with the understanding that we will, if either party desires it, debate another five nights, say before the first of March, provided that a less number of evenings shall not be mutually satisfactory. That you may be able at once to decide in respect to this point, I will add that I should prefer not to commence the debate if you are to have it in your power to terminate it *finally*, without my concurrence, in a less number of sessions than *ten*. I trust you will think favorably of the view I entertain touching this part of our preliminary understanding.

4. Now as to "the form of the question." The one you propose—"*Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?*"—is objectionable, and I cannot accept it. There should be no ambiguity in the question, and there need be none. If you are prepared to affirm that the Scriptures *do* "teach the resurrection of the wicked," you cannot be unwilling to affirm that they inculcate the *revival* of the wicked dead. If it is your belief that the impenitent dead are to be the subjects of a resurrection which will not give them a temporary *life*, you are not the man with whom I wish to debate. But you *do* believe they will *live again* by a resurrection. Let the question then be this : "*Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will live again?*"—Should you deem it of the slightest importance to add the words "*by a resurrection*," you may do so, but let us retain the words "*live again*" or "*be made alive*." If you shaped the question in the manner you did with the expectation that your only *necessary* labor would be to cite our blessed Lord's utterance concerning the "resurrection of damnation" (John v. 29), you have now my permission to believe that, in the event of a discussion between us, you would not be allowed to *assume* that any one will be brought to *life* by *that* "resurrection."—The "*pith*" of the expression appears to *me* to exclude such an idea.

Hoping to be advised without unnecessary delay of your conclusion in regard to my proposal,

I remain your affectionate brother,

RUFUS WENDELL.

LETTER No. 4.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 23, 1862.

Dear Bro. Wendell:—Yours of the 19th inst. was duly received.

Touching the number of evenings for the discussion, I cannot see the need of so many as you name—*ten*. I still think we can just as well give the subject a *thorough* examination in four or five evenings, as well as to be longer. In most

of my debates, when we have taken up the *two* questions of the sleep of the dead and the destruction of the wicked, I had but *four* evenings, as in the case of Dr. Litch.

I am in favor of having sufficient time to do the work *well*; but do not believe in talking for the sake of making speeches, as do Congressmen, when they wish to cultivate their powers of eloquence. Indeed, I see no reason why we might not discuss the subject as well in *two* evenings as *ten*. But we will not divide on this point.

"Now as to 'the form of the question.'" You object to the one proposed:—"Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?"

I am *surprised* at your objection, for it appears to me that this form involves the point, at issue between us, in the *simplest* and *clearest* language by which it can be expressed; and this was my aim. I designed to have it so *plain*, that there could be *no possibility* of "ambiguity"; hence I can see no good reason for your objection. I believe in "the resurrection of the wicked," and you believe in "the non-resurrection of the wicked." By *resurrection*, I mean what Mr. Webster gives as the definition of the word:—"A rising again; chiefly, the revival of the dead of the human race, or their return from the grave."

With this explanation, there can be no chance for "ambiguity" in the form of the question proposed for your acceptance; therefore I can see no cause to change it, as it now most *clearly* states my position as opposed to yours; and I cannot conceive of a form that will do it better.

If you wish to debate the subject, I trust you will no longer object to the *question* proposed. Your Bro. in Christ, MILES GRANT.

LETTER No. 5.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Mass., Dec. 24, 1862.

Dear Bro. Miles:—Your favor of yesterday, in response to my last, is received, and as it requires an answer I set myself forthwith about the work.

1. By your remark, "But we will not divide on this point," I distinctly understand that, if we enter upon the proposed debate, you will not be at liberty without my concurrence to terminate it in less than ten evenings. So far, therefore, we understand each other, and will regard this preliminary item as settled. If the event shall show that we can "discuss the subject as well in *two* evenings as *ten*," you will not be more gratified with the fact than I shall be, though you may be less surprised. I trust I shall be enabled to avoid even the appearance of "talking for the sake of making speeches": to convince you and such of our hearers as are not already convinced *that there is no future life whatever for the wicked dead*, will be the object which I shall have distinctly in view throughout the discussion, and I shall aim at its accomplishment with as much directness as I can command.

2. The form of the question presents itself for further consideration. Your suggestions on this point utterly fail to show that I should not adhere to my purpose not to accept the question you have proposed. "The point at issue between us," as you very well know, has respect to the question whether the wicked dead will *live again*, and you are entirely mistaken if you suppose that your form of question presents *this* issue "in the *simplest* and *clearest* language by which it can be expressed." We want a question which does not need "explanation." That the one you propose, and seem inclined to insist upon, is not of this character, and should hence be rejected by me, will be apparent to any who regard the fact that I believe that "the *resurrection* of damnation" brought to view in John 5 : 29 *does* apply to "the wicked" dead. Your interpretation of the phrase just cited from John 5 : 29, if you believe it teaches a *revival* of the wicked, I dissent from, while your method of quoting from the Dictionary justifies the suspicion (which, however, is more than a mere suspicion in my mind) that "by resurrection" *you* do *not*, after all, "mean what Mr. Webster gives as the definition of the word." *You close* his definition with the word "grave," whereas Webster follows that word with a comma, and adds, "particularly at the general judgment." If you will give it as your opinion that Mr. Webster means by his definition that one portion of "the human race" are to be raised from the dead one thousand years later than another portion, I will believe that his definition satisfies *you* just as it stands in the Dictionary, in spite of its abridgement in your letter. But not to dwell upon this point; a simpler and clearer question than the one your propose is this,—"Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will live again?" Again I say, add the words "by a resurrection" if you please, but do not fail to affirm in some direct and unmistakable way that dead sinners will have *life*.

If the *directness* of the question I propose startles you somewhat, I would consent to a little circumlocution for your sake, and take the negative of the following:—"Do the Holy Scriptures warrant the belief that the wicked dead will ever have a conscious existence?" You seem to prefer being on the affirmative in the debate; if, however, your choice would be to take the negative, you may insert "not" before "live again" in the first question above, or "never" in the place of "ever" in the second. That we may reach an early decision as to whether we will debate or not, I will add that—while, for the Truth's sake, I desire to engage in the discussion with you *if* you deem me in error concerning the revival of the wicked dead—I have (for the present, at least) no further propositions to make to you touching the form of the question to be debated. I wish to have no discussion with you if you do not believe the wicked dead will live again, or if, believing it, you insist upon a form of question which does not in the most unmistakable manner commit you to that proposition. When the subject was first discussed in the EXAMINER, the question was, "Will the wicked dead live again?"—Bro. Grew on the affirmative, and Bro. Storrs on the negative. Bro. G. found no fault with the form of the question, however much of difficulty he may have found in maintaining his ground. Should you decline to affirm directly (in debate) the *revival* of the wicked dead, do not fail to indicate the ground of your unwillingness. If the discussion falls through, I am not the only one interested in knowing the precise reason. You may rest assured that I shall not willingly suffer the impression to obtain that *I* have not been anxious to have the question stated in the most unambiguous, and therefore unobjectionable, form possible. In the question debated by Dr. Litch and yourself I find the phrase "*conscious* misery," from which I infer that *you* were

determined that there should be no loophole for a misunderstanding as to the nature of the Doctor's undertaking. But I have said enough.

In conclusion, permit me to assure you that, if your convictions are in the smallest degree unsettled on the question of our difference, I have no desire whatever to draw you into a debate, for in that case you ought to have time to go over the investigation carefully and calmly. I am not without the hope that you may yet become as bold and efficient a defender of Life only in Christ as you now are of No Immortality out of Christ. Yours in the Lord,

RUFUS WENDELL.

P. S.—Your sermon here on Demonology and Spiritualism did much good. Write by return mail if possible. R. W.

LETTER No. 6.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 26th, 1862.

Dear Bro. Wendell:—Yours of the 24th inst. is just received and examined. You think I "do *not*, after all, 'mean what Mr. Webster gives as the definition of the word,'" resurrection. *I* think I *do*.

I mean by the resurrection of the righteous or wicked, that they will come to *life again, after they have died*. I mean nothing *short* of this; hence Mr. Webster expresses my belief as to the meaning of the word.

You say, "If your (my) convictions are in the smallest degree unsettled on the question of our difference, I (you) have no desire whatever to draw you (me) into debate."

On this point, I would simply say, my "convictions are" not "in the SMALLEST DEGREE UNSETTLED" in the *fullest possible* belief that there will be a resurrection of the wicked dead; and, by the help of the *Lord*, will endeavor to sustain the affirmative of the following question:—

"*Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?*"

I do not yet see any good reason to adopt some other form of question, so long as this *fully* involves the point at issue between us.

With what I have said, before you, there can be *no room* for a *shade* of "ambiguity" in the matter.

If you are decided not to discuss *this* question, please say so, and the matter is ended.

Please answer by return mail, if convenient.

Your Bro. in Christ, MILES GRANT.

LETTER No. 7.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

On the Cars, Dec. 27, 1862.

Dear Bro. Grant:—Yours of the 26th has just come to hand. In reply, I have to inform you that my decision not to discuss the question you have proposed (viz., "Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?") remains unchanged. My only objection to it is that it does not *express* what you say you "*mean*" by it. As a last effort to bring you to terms before this correspondence between us closes, I offer now to take the negative of a question which, while it retains the entire substance of yours, embodies also your definition of one of its principal terms. It is as follows:—"Do the Scriptures teach that the wicked, by a resurrection, will come to *life again, after they have died?*"

Please to indicate at once your acceptance or rejection of the foregoing question. Yours affectionately, RUFUS WENDELL.

LETTER No. 8.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 29, 1862.

Dear Bro. Wendell:—Yours of the 27th inst. is at hand, and contents noticed. You say you are decided not to discuss the question I have proposed, and remark:—"My only objection to it is, that it does not *express* what you say you '*mean*' by it."

So far as I know, it expresses *just what I* "*mean* by it;" and still further, I understand it to express very *clearly* the point of difference between us, and for this reason prefer it to any other form of question, which may be more *wordy*, but less simple. If you are willing to meet the point at issue between us, in the *open field*, I see no valid reason for your refusal; neither can I conceive of any good reason for my accepting a form of words not found in the Scriptures, which would only serve to throw the whole matter into confusion.

Whenever you become willing to discuss the simple question I have proposed, which, as I conceive, expresses in the *plainest possible terms* the point of dispute between us; please inform me, and I shall be glad, by the help of the Lord, to stand up in its defense. Till you shall come to such a conclusion, I must consider this "As a last effort to bring you to terms," and the close of our correspondence on the subject. Your Bro. in Christ, MILES GRANT.

LETTER No. 9.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Monday morning, Dec. 29, 1862.

Dear Bro. Grant:—In answer to my note of the 27th inst., containing what was then intended "as a last effort to bring you to terms," you stated to me verbally on Saturday evening that you were unwilling to relinquish the form of question which you had insisted on in your letters. In connection with this avowal you departed so far from your epistolary reticence as to state the grounds upon which all my overtures had been rejected. Your having done this justifies one more attempt on my part to convince you that the position you have taken is utterly wrong and wholly unworthy of the reputation you have acquired as a public debater. And I am especially impelled to make this further effort from the consideration that (in our private interview) you have protested with the warmest emphasis against the suggestion that you dared not to meet the real issue which divides us, or that you were unwilling to do so. Convinced that, as the matter now stands, the verdict of competent and impartial judges will be against you, I give you one more chance to decide that you *will* meet me in "debate on the question of difference between us respecting the relation of the wicked dead to a future *life*." Endeavoring to be brief, I remark—

1. The only question *you* have proposed is this:—"Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?" *Why* do I refuse to accept this form of question? Why *must* I thus refuse? I answer, —for the reason that I cannot conscientiously assume the negative of the question in its unexplained form. Christ declares that "they that have done evil" (meaning "the wicked," as I understand him) shall come forth unto the "*resurrection* of damnation" (condemnation). You receive this statement of our Lord, and it is your "*fullest possible* belief" that it contains an assertion of the *revival* of the wicked dead; —I too believe His declaration, but with all my heart I reject *your interpretation* of its import, being "rooted and grounded" in the con-

viction that by the asserted "resurrection" the unholy will *not* "come to *life again, after they have died.*" If we debate, *we must ourselves agree as to the import of the question;* but, since *your* question contains a term whose import we do *not* understand alike in a passage of Holy Writ where we *do* agree in applying it to "*the wicked,*" nothing could surpass the absurdity of my accepting your proposal, unless it be your assurance in seeking to force an objectionable question upon me, or the unfairness of your refusal to let your own question exhibit *the sense in which you use the word resurrection.* Had Dr. Litch asked you to take the negative of the question, "Do the Scriptures teach the everlasting *punishment* of the wicked?"—if you had not laughed him to scorn, you would most assuredly have refused compliance; and yet it should be obvious to the most common understanding that such a proposal from him finds a parallel in yours to me. While I accept joyfully any reproach that may arise from my rejection of what you deem the true *interpretation* of John 5: 28, 29, I must beg to be excused from assuming a position in debate which might *seem*, to say the least, to involve either an entire oblivion of the passage, or a deliberate denial of its verity.

You hinted in our interview that I was seeking an improper *advantage* over you in the statement of a question. I ought not to be required to meet such an insinuation, but the Lord is witness that no such thought has entered my mind. The suggestion, however, finds an ample refutation in what I have written you in this correspondence, and, if we do not debate, you will place me under lasting obligations if you will adhere to your purpose to lay our letters before the readers of the *Crisis.* If the proposed debate falls through, I take it that our brethren in Boston, who hold to the revival of the wicked dead, will no longer feel authorized to say (as one of them has, I believe, repeatedly said)—"Bro. Grant is willing to discuss the subject." Mark this prediction.

You have claimed in your letters that, because you have informed me what *you* "*mean*" by the word "resurrection" in your question, there can be no "ambiguity" in it. This is a senseless claim on your part unless you "mean" by it that you will *defend your definition* of the term in every passage where you may claim that it is used in relation to the wicked dead. This you would be compelled to do, or our discussion would be a complete farce. For instance, if we were discussing the import of John 5: 28, 59, I should take the ground that the righteous and wicked will literally "come forth," and that both classes are *dead* when they "come forth." Then I should maintain that the proper antithesis of a "resurrection *of* LIFE" cannot be a "resurrection" which *rivives* the wicked. (At this point the new theory of a corruptible resurrection life for the righteous, which you regard with favor, would naturally present itself for consideration.) Now, if our discussion could not be prosecuted unless you should undertake to prove that the wicked dead will *live again,* and if you are willing to engage in a contest which you know will at once and inevitably impose this burden upon you, in the name of reason and common sense tell me, if you can, why the question for discussion

shall not plainly commit you to this imperative task. You believe the wicked dead will *live again.* I believe they will be *eternally held in the embrace of death.* These two statements indicate the nature of our difference, while they suggest most clearly that you should either take the affirmative of the question, "Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will live again?"—or you should let me take the affirmative of the following: "Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will never live again?" Your persistent rejection of *both* these questions will be proof demonstrative that you have not the slightest claim to be regarded by others as willing to controvert the real issue between us "in public oral debate."

2. The objection you offered (verbally) to my form of question was, that it is couched in language not found in the Scriptures, and is hence objectionable. The real strength of this hiding place may be readily exhibited.

(1.) Did you ever, in all your twenty-eight discussions, debate a question which might not have been objected to on the same ground?

(2.) Is not the question you propose for my acceptance obnoxious to the same objection?

(3.) Your objection is the merest trifling unless you take the ground that, in your discussions with men who believe the Bible ("ministers of the same denomination" with yourself, for example), you will debate no question which does not commit your opponent to a deliberate denial of statements which he knows the Bible contains. Such a demand is to be tolerated only in men who have lost their reason, but who, on that very account, should not be encouraged to engage in "public oral debate," except by the advice of their physicians.

(4.) I now remark that the *imaginary character* of your objection completely annihilates it. Let us see. The phrases to which you object in my forms of question are "*live again*" and "*be made alive.*"—Now it happens, my dear brother, that you have for years, to my certain knowledge, maintained that these phrases *are* Scriptural, and that they are both applied in the Bible to the resurrection of the wicked. Take the first, "*live again,*" and turn to Rev. 20: 5,—"But the rest of the dead LIVED not AGAIN until the thousand years were finished." Now it is your position (and you have repeatedly avowed it) that "the rest of the dead" here means "*the wicked dead*" named in my question, and that the text teaches by direct implication that *they will* "LIVE AGAIN" when the "thousand years" *are* "finished."—By this short process do I show that *you* have no right to cavil at the phrase "live again." Just so with the other—"*be made alive.*"—The Apostle declares, "in Christ shall all BE MADE ALIVE" (1 Cor. 15: 22), and ever since I have known you it has been your position (and I have heard you virtually affirm it during the present month) that "*the wicked dead*" are embraced in this statement. Comment is unnecessary. Your objection crumbles to nothing, and you are left in the attitude of insisting that I shall take the negative of your question when I am unable to do so conscientiously, and of refusing at the same time to affirm a proposition which, while it presents our

difference in the most unmistakable manner, has, according to your own emphatic assertion, your "fullest possible belief."

If what I have now written shall have the effect to alter your determination, I wish you without fail to insert the accompanying Notice of our Discussion on the editorial page of this week's *Crisis*. Should you, however, persist in your refusal to discard your question for one that I have proposed, you will not only have placed yourself in a disadvantageous light before the tribunal (the public) which is to judge between us, but you will also have insured yourself against the remotest probability of ever again exciting my surprise by any thing bearing the character of downright puerility.—While I use "great plainness of speech," I do not cease to love you, and therefore subscribe myself, as ever,

Your affectionate brother, RUFUS WENDELL.

P. S., 4 o'clock, P. M.—The foregoing letter was written between three and eight o'clock this morning. Within the past hour I have received your letter of this date, in answer to mine of the 27th, and have carefully perused it. The only reply I desire to make is to say that if the decision it communicates (in substance the same as your verbal answer on Saturday evening) is not modified by what I have now written, you may consider this postscript and the letter which precedes it as the close of my part of "our correspondence on the subject." RUFUS WENDELL.

NOTE.—When Bro. Grant had read my last letter he was urged, in a personal interview, to recede from his demand respecting a form of question for debate. But, like Paul on one occasion, "he would not be persuaded;" and hence no Discussion was held. The Correspondence is now published that the friends in Boston and elsewhere may judge of the merits of his refusal, and to correct the opinion of such as deem willing to defend, in public debate, the position that the wicked dead will live again.

Bro. Grant informs me that he intends to publish in the *Crisis* of next week the first eight of the foregoing letters, but he declines giving his readers my last letter to him. This does not surprise me, and the regret occasioned by his decision i alleviated by the admiration excited by his caution. The readers of the Examiner will oblige me by placing "Letter No. 9" under the eye of those of the *Crisis*, that they may see the answer rendered to Bro. G.'s frivolous objections to the questions proposed for his acceptance. I wish it likewise borne in mind that my brother has propounded a theory of debate which he will be compelled to violate in any future discussion of Bible questions upon which he may enter.

Bro. G. is in error in supposing that my question would have tended "to throw the *whole* matter into *confusion*." Had he said that it would throw him into "confusion" he would only have anticipated the conclusion which I think will be drawn generally by the readers of our correspondence. "Confusion," in the event of a debate, there would have been, doubtless, but out of it I am persuaded the precious doctrine of LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST would have emerged with a strength and glory that must have commended it to the approval of many lovers of truth who desire to "prove all things" and "hold fast that which is good."

January 19, 1863. RUFUS WENDELL.

THE JUDGMENT.—In our article on this subject in the EXAMINER for March, 1861, we asked of those who believe the righteous will have a priority, in time, in the resurrection.

"How is it to be known who are to have part in this favored class, if all in their graves have not been judged *before* the resurrection begins? Are the righteous to be raised and then the process of judgment to be instituted to see whether the Searcher of hearts has made a mistake? Or, are they to undergo an examination after their resurrection, as if suspected characters? Can we adopt either of these positions? If not, must it not be manifest, they had been judged *before* being raised? And why are not the wicked raised at the same instant, except they also had been judged and found unworthy to have part in this prior resurrection?"

We now add, There is no escape from these questions by those who hold *all men* are revived at the *same time*, and yet say, the *wicked* are raised *corruptible*: for, it is clear, the righteous come up *in*corruptible and immortal—"the dead shall be *raised* incorruptible:" 1 Cor. 15 : 52. Why this distinction in the revival state, if both classes had not been judged prior to it?—Why should one class come into life incorruptible rather than the other, if their destiny had not been decided previously?—Pressed by these questions, the advocates of the re-living of the wicked dead, have been compelled to change their ground, and now assume, both the righteous and wicked are raised corruptible, and continue so till after the judgment! But instead of extricating themselves from difficulty by this shift, they are involved in still greater absurdities, besides flatly contradicting the apostle, who says, unqualifiedly, "the dead are raised incorruptible."

The absurdity of this position will appear from a few considerations. Some *period* must be allotted to the day of judgment; and it matters but little what the time is, whether a "thousand years" or ten million. While it lasts, mortal beings must be fed by cultivating the earth or by a miracle. If by either, it implies *mercy* to the wicked; who, according to these theorists, are to have no mercy after their resurrection. The theory also involves the idea of keeping the righteous in a mortal state for a period vastly longer than their present life: and whether mortality then—in the resurrection state—will be at-

tended with weariness and pain may be only a matter of conjecture: it must inevitably be, to most of the righteous, a state of suspense, which cannot be an agreeable condition: and the righteous are likely to have a longer period of infelicity after the resurrection than the whole of this present life!

In opposition to such a wild and unscriptural notion of a resurrection, we oppose the Apostle's statement that, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, IN A MOMENT, in the *twinkling of an eye*, AT THE LAST TRUMP: for the trumpet shall sound, and THE DEAD shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed: for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality: so when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory:" *not after* a subsequent judgment.

"The day of judgment," according to these new theorists, in which the whole race of Adam are to undergo a *personal* examination in regard to all they have done, said, and thought, is to be just as long as it takes to "*twinkle the eye:*" or, "*a moment!*" Such a "day of judgment" is not very terrific! Might we not say, the theory makes void a day of judgment altogether! It is a mockery to call such a farce, as this theory involves, "*The day of Judgment*"!

It is clear to us, the judgment which decides character and doom is at some period prior to the resurrection of the righteous; and that the resurrection is the *executive* judgment, executed by the Son of God—as "*the Son of man*"—to whom God has "given authority" to carry out the *prior* decision on all the race: the righteous to be made alive, incorruptible and immortal: the wicked "*not* to see life, but the wrath of God to abide on them;" eternally to "REMAIN IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE DEAD." John 3: 36. Prov. 21: 16.

"RETRIBUTION" is a work by H. L. Hastings, written to oppose the doctrine of "no life from the dead for the wicked."—We say this for the information of our new subscribers. The

Advent Herald, Boston, edited by S. Bliss, speaking of those who hold to life only through Christ, says:

"There is an important issue here involved,—between the two classes of those claiming to hold 'no life out of Christ.'—For if life there means existence, it would preclude the resurrection of the wicked; but if *that* life is a specific condition of existence, it knocks from under [them] the prop on which unconsciousness rests. The advocates of final extinction of being, and yet holding the resurrection of the wicked, are in a dilemma,—either horn of which is fatal to them. For, to be consistent, they must give up either the one or the other of those positions.

We thank the *Herald* for saying thus much. That is the true state of the case. Prove the wicked dead have a resurrection into life—by which we mean a *living* "existence"—and we will yield the whole argument: for "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, *even* the resurrection *from* the dead *** cannot die any more." There is no "final extinction of being" to any soul of man who lives again from the dead at the last day. Settle the point that all men will have a revival into a living state from the dead, and one of two things inevitably follows, *viz.:* eternal misery to the wicked, or universal salvation and glory. "The advocates of final extinction of being, and yet holding the resurrection of the wicked, are," truly, in a sad "dilemma;" and to them it is a "fatal" one. They came up to the *crowning truth* of the theory of "No life out of Christ," *viz.*, "No life from the dead for the wicked," and here they halted, stumbled, and fell. They are like those disciples, who at the close of Jesus' great life sermon, John 6th, said, "This is a hard saying: who can hear it?" From that time they "went back and walked no more with Him." So we expect it will be now. It is impossible to maintain the position they at present occupy.

AN ARMY DIALOGUE.—"Speaking evil of the things they understand not" is a common thing. Some do so from the fact they do *not* understand: others not simply from this fact, but from an unwillingness to understand anything that differs from their present notions. An illustration of the Scripture com-

mencing these remarks was exhibited here in the army a short time since between P. and the Colonel.

P.—Is a soldier obliged by the army regulations to attend service every Sunday, when he don't believe the doctrine preached by the Chaplain? Col.—Yes. Why? P.—I don't believe in the doctrine preached, and came to ask the question. Col.—Are you a Catholic, sir? P.—No, sir. Col.—What then, sir? P.—I am an Adventist. Col.—O, well, there is so little difference between them and our Chaplain [a close communion Baptist] that it will make no difference with you. I don't make the Catholics go, but it matters not with you; for our Chaplain believes in the Lord's coming as much as you do! P.—The coming of the Lord is a small portion of the difference in our belief. Col.—What then is the difference? P.—I do not believe in the immortality of the soul, nor the eternal misery of the wicked; but he does, and preaches it every Sunday. Col.—What! you don't believe in the immortality of the soul? P.—No, sir! Col.—Well, my private opinion, profanely expressed, is, that any man that don't believe the soul is immortal is a d—d fool; that's all: so you better go and hear a little Christianity; it may do you good.

A CATECHISM FOR THE TIMES.

COMMENDED TO ALL WHO SINCERELY DESIRE AND SEEK AFTER THE TRUTH.

Question 1.—What is faith in its true sense? *Answer.*—"Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Heb. 11: 1. *Ques.* 2.—How many kinds of faith are there? *Ans.*—Three. *Ques.* 3.—What are the different kinds of faith mentioned in the Bible? *Ans.*—Vain, dead, and living faith. *Ques.* 4.—What kind of faith is acceptable to God, and will prove a saving faith to us? *Ans.*—Active, or living faith. *Ques.* 5.—Who was the founder, or father of faith? *Ans.*—Abraham. *Ques.* 6.—Is faith a principle perfect in itself or must we perfect it? *Ans.*—We must perfect it. *Ques.* 7.—How can we perfect our faith? *Ans.*—By works. James 2: 22. *Ques.* 8.—Was Abraham's faith and works agreeable to each other? *Ans.*—They were. James 2: 21, 22. *Ques.* 9.—Was his example, Gen. 14: 13 to 17, agreeable to the precepts left to us by him, and cited by the Saviour and the Apostles? *Ans.*—We think they were, for we are directed by the Saviour and the Prophets to look to Abraham. *Ques.* 10. Does the precepts and example of Christ conflict with or annul the faith or works of Abraham? *Ans.*—Abraham by his works

pleased God,—James 2: 21 and on,—and Jesus said, If I do not the works of Him that sent me, believe me not: therefore we conclude that the faith and works of Jesus were agreeable with those of Abraham. *Ques.* 11.—If the acts of Abraham,—Gen. 14: 13 to 17,—were justifiable, then will the elapse of time bring condemnation to those who would follow his example? *Ans.*—An act in the right spirit, in the father of the faithful, never became a wrong in the children, if done by the same spirit. *Ques.* 12.—Did Abraham do his enemies,—Gen. 14: 15 to 20,—any wrong? *Ans.*—We think not, because he received the blessing of the most high God, at the hand of the Priest, when he returned victorious over his enemies. *Ques.* 13.—Can any of those that have gone forth in this war, with a true intent to free the oppressed, break every bond, and assist the bound in procuring their freedom, look to the most high God for any blessing? Knowing that God is not a respecter of persons, and being assured from the Scriptures of the eternity of His purposes, we think the foregoing a sufficient answer to the thirteen questions.

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner.—In Vol. 15, No. 21, of the *World's Crisis*, there appeared an article headed, "A Catechism for the Times," by Bro. Thayer, in which he tried to show, by questions and what he supposed to be answers, that good men could not bear arms in this war. I thought there could be no objections to both sides of the question being published in that paper, and so took the liberty to write the foregoing Catechism and forwarded it to the *Crisis*. But it appears that it found no place in the columns of that paper. If you should judge it worthy of notice, you will please publish it.

Co. A, 7th Reg. Conn. Vol. ALBERT W. PIERCE.
Beaufort, S. C.

THE MIRROR.

FROM O. R. L. CROZIER, MICHIGAN.

To Ed. of Exr.—In my "Question of Privilege" in the Dec. Examiner, I constructed a mirror for the *Harbinger*, mainly of quotations from its own pages, hoping it would reform at sight of itself; but I am sorry to see, by its issue of Dec. 10, that my good offices, like rays of light in passing through hostile substances, have been prevented from their intended and greatly needed mission. For, losing

temper under kind reproof, that captious sheet again offends good taste by crying "*vile slang!*"—a cheap rejoinder to stubborn facts and unanswerable arguments, such as I have presented against its position and course.

Among the many texts enjoining propriety of speech, and deportment which are forgotten by its Editor, is 1 Tim. 5 : 1 : "Rebuke not an Elder, but entreat him as a father." Had he, who is a mere youth and a *novice* in the cause, thought of this text, he could hardly have been so uncivil as to *snub* the most venerable Elder among us, as he did you, by telling you, It is "*none of your business*"! Is this a specimen of the "more select reading matter," promised in the new form? Such *coarseness* neither indicates Christian refinement in its author, nor is it calculated to foster it among its readers.

The "*personal abuse*" complained of, must refer to my apology for his hostility to our government on the ground of his being an Englishman. Some of the English are as liberal-minded as any people living; but, unfortunately, our English Editors are not of that class. Dr. Thomas, Editor of the Herald of the Kingdom, characterized the two contending parties in our national struggle, as "*Rebeldom and Rabbledom*," and his echo of the *Harbinger*, has regarded them in about the same way. They betray even a partiality for the tyrant's lash, and take to its use in their theology and religious policy with great facility. It is the intolerant *British* spirit of *Thomasism*, as much, perhaps, as anything else, that is producing discord and division among us, and bringing into contempt some of the most glorious doctrines of revelation. Wonder if this isn't one of the "unclean spirits:" its vocabulary, pompous, spiteful and vulgar, might seem to indicate such a family affinity. And yet many most excellent brethren are imbibing that spirit under specious names. I am satisfied it is one of Satan's snares—a mischievous device to hinder the Gospel.

The Proclamation of Freedom!

Since writing the foregoing, the President's PROCLAMATION OF FREEDOM—a New Year's Gift to more than three millions of persons—has been published! This is a direct fruit of the war. Many thousands have been made actually free before, in its progress; and the entire extinction of slavery in our country only depends, under God, upon the Government's being firmly supported in the prosecution of the war. This pays us pretty well for the scorn and misrepresentation we have suffered from those who, under the guise or in the fog of "non-resistance," try to hide their hatred or fail to show their love of freedom for the poor. We have no reason to hope the former will repent of their heartless hypocrisy; they will still find means to deceive and mislead those whom they can influence. But some of the latter will, doubtless, see and acknowledge the light on this great subject, though it be in the glowing path of "THE LORD OF HOSTS."

I love to turn away from unfeeling false shepherds, to rejoice with the humble poor. God be praised that the sword of executive justice is hewing the way for light to their miserable abodes. It seems appropriate that their exodus from the house of bondage should be through the blood of their oppressors. How patient they have been! How devoufly they have prayed, and hoped, and waited, and believed that God would give them freedom. And while the precious boon has again and again been almost within reach and snatched away, not an outrage have they committed: they have been unvaryingly true to the Government, and when regularly enrolled in its service have fought the enemies of good order and humanity with true Christian courage. They have proved themselves worthy of the sympathy and aid of their friends. May God bless them, and bless every means used for their benefit.

THE DIFFERENCE.

BY T. P. LEWIS, HARTWICK, N. Y.

THE difference in what? Why the difference between the righteous and the wicked. Is there any if the wicked are never raised to life? In "Retribution," p. 9, the following seems to be made the basis of argument.

"Strict and even-handed justice, according to the laws of God or man, is not meted out to all mankind in this life, or in this world. No fact can be plainer than this. Oftentimes the good are oppressed, and the bad triumph over them. The vile are exalted and the righteous are trodden down. *The innocent are punished* and the guilty escape. The pure are slandered and the infamous are praised. The godly are persecuted and the ungodly are honored." In consideration of these statements, the conclusion is drawn, "there must be a future state of rewards and punishments beyond this world where present inequalities may be adjusted, virtues rewarded," &c., &c.

Now, to him who views this matter superficially, and who, consequently, fails properly to "discern between the righteous and the wicked," the above appears correct. But what are the facts in the case? Paul says, Rom. 8 : 28, "We know that *all things* work together for good *to them that love God*." If this be true, it may be, justice *is* "meted out," after all, without the wicked dead living again. Do "the bad triumph over" the good? The good in the end lose nothing by it, since all things

work together for their good. "The righteous" are, in fact, gainers, though "the vile" are exalted over them; for all things work for their good. But that "the innocent are punished," does not appear quite so plain to me. That they sometimes suffer unjustly, I admit. But in 2 Tim. 2 : 12, we read : "If we suffer we shall also reign with him;" and 1 Peter 3 : 14, "If ye suffer for righteousness' sake happy are ye." Again 1 Peter 1 : 7, "The trial of your faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth." Also 2 Cor. 4 : 17, 18, "For our light affliction which is but for a moment *worketh for us* a *far more exceeding* and *eternal weight of glory;* while we look not at the things which are seen but at the things which are not seen." Now, can a man be said to be *punished* when his afflictions, trials and sufferings produce such glory and benefit as are here described? The trouble is, "H. L. H." looks too much "at the things which are seen," and too little "at the things which are not seen." The poet expresses the truth as follows :

> "Our troubles and our trials here,
> Will only make us richer there,
> When we arrive at home."

If, then, our afflictions, persecutions, abasements, and various trials, really "work together" for our good, which even "H. L. H." cannot deny, are they not to us "blessings in disguise?"—And if so, should the wicked be raised to a life of suffering, simply because they were instrumental in bringing them upon us? In order that "present inequalities may be adjusted," is it necessary that the wicked should live in a state of torment "beyond this world" at all?

While "all things work together for good to them that love God," the same "things" to the wicked only work for their evil, and render their damnation the more certain. Hence Paul, in 2 Cor. 2 : 15, 16, affirms himself and brethren to be "in them that perish," "the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life." And so it is with all the circumstances and events, with which the two classes come in contact. This common observation and revelation unitedly teach. With these facts before us, how can we fail to see the great difference between the righteous and the wicked even though the latter die to live no more?

But I wish to make one more quotation, viz., Mat. 5 : 11, 12, "*Blessed* are ye when men shall *revile* you, and *persecute* you, and *say all manner of evil* against you *falsely* for my sake. *Rejoice* and be *exceeding glad*, for (or because) *great is your reward in heaven.*" This text, with those previously quoted, will show why a Christian, even though a martyr, can rejoice and be exceeding glad while being reviled, belied, and persecuted.

It is not because their revilers and persecutors are to suffer unspeakable wo and torment; but because these things work out for them a "reward"—"a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." He that can stand by the grave of Him who in life was his worst enemy and feel a desire that the sleeping dust before him may be gathered into life to suffer pain and torment, must possess a spirit incompatible with that which was manifested in the whole life and teachings of our blessed Saviour. He that is not satisfied, that all things should work for his good, and that for his various persecutions he should receive a great "reward in heaven," in my humble opinion, is unfit to live in heaven at all.

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

FROM MRS. M. C. ALLEN, Black Rock.—I have in years past enjoyed reading the EXAMINER very much; but permit me now to say, I could wish its pages were not so much occupied by controversy and criticism, as has appeared of late; and likewise that we as a denomination, (our numbers I suppose would now class us in such category,) were more united in doctrine; but if that *may not* be, that we could quietly agree to differ. If a brother or sister cannot see just as another, still, if basing their doctrinal belief conscientiously upon what is believed by them to be scriptural truth, and their practice is consistent and in accordance with our Saviour's teaching, that a mantle of charity might be thrown over minor differences, and each exercise that forbearance in Christian love, which is due from one another, as professed disciples of Christ. The above remarks I do not apply to *any* exclusively, but I have lamented in all our publications, that some writers have not that spirit of toleration that becomes members of the Christian family, or, that corresponds to the teaching of the gospel. You have ever counseled your readers, as well as taken it for your motto, that they should "search the Scriptures;" and I believe you consider it each one's duty to do so; but if after carefully and prayerfully attending to the command, they *cannot* see as you do regarding the non-resurrection of the wicked—is it profitable for your readers that the favorite theme, together with that of baptism, should be dwelt upon so largely in the pages of the EXAMINER? I ask the question in humility, and in absence of any dictatorial feeling. As I resort to the fountain of truth, the only guide we have for light, to regulate our belief and practice, I deduce nothing from that source to contradict the plain assertion, that there will be a resurrection of the *unjust* as well as the just. I do not see why one might not as consistently apply the almost numberless passages of sacred writ, which promises *life, long life,* and "*shall not see death,*" to prove those who love God and keep his commandments shall never taste of death temporal, as, that those adduced to prove the non-resurrection of the wicked, *makes clear the fact,*

that they "shall never rise"—"they have become extinct," &c. To me these and like passages seem plainly to refer to the future, "the second death," or, as a great writer expresses it, "the second installment of death."

Will you please give an explanation in your next number, of Heb. 10 : 26–30? Perhaps others as well as myself might be benefited.

—

"Heb. 10 : 26 to 30."—In compliance with Mrs. M. C. Allen's request (see her letter) we give—if not "an explanation"—a *rendering* of this text, which is simply Prof. Murdock's translation of the Syriac version. It reads thus :

"For if a man sin voluntarily, after he hath received a knowledge of the truth, there is no longer a sacrifice which may be offered for sins : but the fearful judgment impendeth, and the zeal of fire that consumeth the adversaries. For if he who transgressed the law of Moses, died without mercies, at the mouth of two or three witnesses; how much more, think ye, will he receive *capital punishment*, who hath trodden upon the Son of God, and hath accounted the blood of his covenant, by which he is sanctified, as the blood of all men, and hath treated the Spirit of grace with contumely? For we know him who hath said, Retribution is mine, and I will repay : and again, The Lord will judge his people."

By this translation all obscurity is removed from the text, and it hardly needs any "explanation" by us. The CERTAINTY of "*capital punishment*" is what the apostle is urging on the *Hebrews* who had "received a knowledge of the truth," if they "voluntarily" turned from the "sacrifice offered for sins."—The text relates to such apostates ; and warns them, there is no escape from DEATH, the "*capital* punishment" for them.—There is no other DELIVERER from that punishment except "the Son of God ;" and He being rejected by these apostates, there was no hope in their case. It is those who *were* the LORD'S "PEOPLE" by calling or profession : such apostate people He will "judge ;" *i. e.*, inflict on them the punishment of death, unrevoked ; which is a "fearful thing." Let all who are tempted to apostacy, beware.

—

FROM MRS. POLLY G. PITTS, Wis.—May God abundantly bless your endeavors to spread the light of His everlasting rock-foundation *word*—"Life only through Jesus, the LIFE-GIVER ;" and that only to the righteous at the return of their Lord. O, I am revived, strengthened, and grow stronger every day in defense of truth as it is in Jesus, the resurrection and the life. Thanks be to God, the truth is spreading, and therein I do rejoice, and feel to lift up my head, knowing that our redemption draweth nigh. I hope with you and the whole elect of God, soon to join with the great voices in heaven saying "The kingdoms of *this world* are become the Kingdom of our Lord and His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever." My husband says, I must tell you, he is old and poor, and owes you more than he can ever pay, for the light you have been the means of his receiving. We hope, in mercy to fallen man, the EXAMINER will be continued. We are fallen on perilous times. It does appear to me, the nation has become like the chaff of the summer's threshing-floor, and that these political winds will dissolve or carry it away. My prayer is, God save thy selected people, and keep us all ready for thy coming kingdom.

—

FROM HELEN ROBERTSON, Utica.—My two *new* "Life only in Christ" friends are going on as they begun, searching daily to see if these things are so : they are deep searchers too. They read and search evenings, and then study out these things while at work days. The wife says, They both (herself and husband) think about them all day and dream about them nights. They are anxious to spread the truth and now send for two copies more of the Six Sermons. Bless the Lord ! I have also found another independent thinker here, a merchant, and have given him "Life only in Christ" to read. I also send another subscriber for the EXAMINER. Some of my friends at a distance say, I was once a Christian, but have gone astray. O, how it grieves me ; but it makes me cleave closer to my heavenly Father. The Lord has comforted me so, and is blessing my labors, I am not sorry I forsook all for life through Christ. If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him. Glory to our Redeemer. In Christ I have peace.

—

MRS. CATHARINE COLVER, Berk. Co., Mass., writes :—These hard times press severely on the poor ; but "the earth is the LORD'S, and the fullness thereof," so we shall be provided with all needful good through this thorny maze. Then let us gird on the whole armor and stand on the foundation of truth, having the shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Thus armed we need not fear. So I send five dollars to help the EXAMINER.

—

FROM O. CLAPP, Boston, Mass.—I received ten copies BIBLE EXAMINER ; have subscribers for four ; if unable to get others I shall lend or give them to the poor. I hope the EXAMINER will be sustained, as it is the only periodical to my knowledge in the world that holds up Christ as man's only hope of life. I would like to have it more than once a month, but cannot expect it as long as times remain as they are now. Your Sermon in the January No. is worth to me the price of the volume. I have read it over several times and receive good every time.—I bless God for the light I have received through the Examiner, and also for the knowledge received at the Wilbraham Camp-Meeting last

August, when the views of "*No Life out of Christ*" took such deep root in the minds of many. May God bless you, and own His truth; and may it be the means (as it is) of leading sinners to Jesus, is the prayer of your Bro. in hope of Life.

—

FROM O. R. L. CROZIER, *Grand Rapids, Mich.*

I thank you for your kind notice of the Union move, in the Dec. No. of EXAMINER. Such an unselfish, generous expression is refreshing in such times as ours. It is not probable that all our papers will be disposed to unite, and it is possible that none of them will. Either of these causes may prevent it—1. Self-interest; 2. Party ambition; 3. A want of confidence in the safety of free investigation.

All opposers will, doubtless, prefer to be placed in the *third* class.—That want of confidence is dual, consisting of want of confidence in Divine Providence, and want of confidence in the judgment and candor of readers. Some men think all men either babes or knaves but themselves; the former to be fed with food selected and prepared, and the latter not to be trusted, lest, in their suicidal folly they select poison instead of aliment. Now such persons need to be taught the very first principle of human improvement, *viz* hat the very exercise of selecting right from wrong, both in doctrine and practice, is essential, and constantly essential, to the formation of character. Hence, the duty of the Christian teacher is, not to keep evil away from his pupils, but to teach them to avoid or overcome it—show them the deformity of error and the symmetry of truth; the disadvantage of wrong, and the advantage of right; the way and the wages of sin, and the way of life, and urge them to follow it.

Twenty years of free investigation has brought the body of Adventists to their present knowledge of the Scriptures. All along some have boded evil of freedom, while others have insisted upon the safety and the importance of proving all things, and these latter have been numerous and strong enough to keep the body moving forward and alive, while some of the former, remaining where they were twenty years ago, have become *fossilized*. The growth of our people in numbers and influence, during this period, is, perhaps, without a parallel. Our history is a demonstration of the practicability of free investigation. It will go on.—Those who oppose it and try to arrest our progress at their most advanced state, might as well try to hold the wind in their fists.

It is resistance to free investigation that has multiplied papers among us beyond our ability to sustain them. The futility of such resistance has been proved. Let it cease: then the whole body can unite in one

or more strong, first-class papers, which will prevent a great waste of funds and add very largely to our strength and usefulness.

It will do good to discuss this matter. It has many bearings; and if our brethren generally come to understand it in its true light, they will force a union, by letting those vigorously alone who try to prevent it.—Rom. 16: 17, 18. Divisions indicate weakness in the body and carnality in its members; 1 Cor. 3. "Let brotherly love continue."

Truly yours in Christ.

—

FROM JAMES CRAWFORD, Roxbury, Mass.—If there is any one point of the gospel I have been more intensely moved upon than another, it is the point of *Christian liberty;* which point should be maintained at any cost, either of the minister in the *pulpit* or conference meeting: and none the less as an organ of publicity of the voice of the church, and a right of every Christian *man, woman,* and child, always keeping in view the golden rule, to do unto others as we should wish them to do unto us, under like circumstances.

There is liberty of the largest kind to be found in the gospel, where every member of the body of Christ can occupy their portion of time in conference meetings without an infringement of the rights of another. So as far as time will permit, each gift and talent may be brought into exercise for the upbuilding of its members; and, if done in the gospel fellowship, each and every one has the largest liberty, and perfect union one with another. But if an unchristian step is taken, and this one is hinted at, as *being in error*, and consequently the curse of God is upon him, in consequence of error, it is as detrimental to the well being of the body at large, and to the individual referred to, as a direct charge of being a hypocrite.

Everything that looks like judging another because he does not think as I do, and thus taking from him the confidence of the brothers is, to my mind, sensual and devilish. Is it true we have been to the school of Christ so long, and have not learned the A B C of the liberty of the gospel? A condemnation of another because he does not think as I do, is the nearest thing to universal damnation of anything that presents itself to my mind. Man's salvation is not based upon the size or shape of the head. The apostle does not say, if any man has not the *brain* of the Lord Jesus Christ, or of an apostle, or of any other man; but, if any man has not the *spirit* of *Christ*, he is none of his.

We are all learners; and if there is a brother or sister in Christ that has made greater progress than any other, let that individual glory in the Lord, that they are thus able to enlighten the scattered flock, and exercise a tenderness for them always in accordance to love and fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ. If I have *erred* in the above, please correct the same. May the Lord guide you in all wisdom, and *lead you tenderly* by the right hand, to proclaim all His truth, and eternal life will be yours.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our friends will bear in mind we are publishing this Magazine at an enormous increase in the expense for paper; and we are sure they do not wish us to bear this alone. We shall go forward, fully believing our hands will be strengthened. That some who have been friends will forsake us, we have calculated; for such has always been the course of a certain class. It was so in Jesus' days; and it is enough for the servant to be as his Master: if some could not or would not endure the truth, that without they eat Christ's flesh and drank His blood—*i. e.*, without a living *union* with Him—they had NO LIFE in them, we need not be surprised that members of the same family are found in our day. From such we expect neither sympathy nor aid; but from those who are willing to follow the truth wherever it leads, we look for it, and shall not look in vain, we trust. Have our friends made an effort to increase the circulation of the EXAMINER? If not, why not make *one* trial, or take *two* copies each, so as to have one to loan among such as cannot pay for it, or who would not otherwise read it at all?

DONATIONS TO SUSTAIN THE EXAMINER FOR 1863.—L. C. Thorne and W. W. Thorne, (New York merchants, and of the Society of Friends), take two copies and pay $20 *each*. Geo. K. Carroll, in their employ, takes four copies, and pays $10. Chas. A. Righter $5. B. Burnett $5. Chas. Archer $5. J. E. Sebring $5. A. McDonald $3. Roswell Curtis $7. Wm. Ockenbock $1. Benj. Terpening $2. Jane Terpening $2. John Webb and Charles Webb $1 each. Dr. J. K. Finley $5. Several in Philadelphia have given $5 each for the same object; and others not named, have given sums less than a dollar; and possibly some names have been omitted that ought to appear; for all these favors we would be thankful.

D. WESTON, of Philadelphia, Pa., fell asleep in Jesus, January 4th, aged 75. He was an early believer in the second advent of Christ and of immortality only through Him. "He died strong in the faith of *life* only in Christ, and of a speedy resurrection." He was the author of several *acrostics* in the EXAMINER, bearing the initials "D. W.": see Vol. 13, pages 64, 136, 388, which were his last efforts in that direction.

ERRATUM.—In January Examiner, p. 25, 11th line from top, read "collocations" instead of "collections."

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

THIS *Magazine* is devoted mainly to Bible questions; specially to the great themes of JESUS CHRIST'S personal return to, and reign on earth—Life, future and eternal, only through Him—and literal death, never to be revoked, as the wages of sin.

It is intended to be issued *Monthly*, 32 pages octavo. TERMS, *One Dollar* for 12 numbers; paid in *advance*.

REMITTANCES.—Persons making communications to us, will please consider it a *receipt* for money they send, if they receive what they write for, instead of our acknowledging their letters in the EXAMINER. Generally, in case of remittance, they receive what they order before the acknowledgment could appear in our Magazine. To *print* all the names of Correspondents is attended with inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

LETTERS should be well sealed, but never "registered." Money for the EXAMINER is at the *Editor's* risk, when sent as herein directed, without adding to, or omitting any thing from the directions. If this course is not complied with, it is at the risk of the person remitting.

MONEY sent for any of the works in our *Catalogue* of Books, is at the risk of the *purchaser*, except when the *retail* price is remitted, then it shall be *mutual*. The risk is small, if our instructions are strictly followed; we will not be responsible in any degree unless this is done. Be careful, in all cases, not to send depreciated Bank bills. We have had to pay *twenty* per cent. on some funds sent us, or else return the money. This ought not to be.

THE POSTAGE on the *bound* Examiner, for 1860, is *twenty-six* cents, any distance less than 3000 miles.

☞ We invite our friends to examine the *Catalogue* of works, on the last page of this cover, and send for such as they can make profitable to themselves or others. By doing this, you will benefit the cause we advocate, and help the EDITOR of this Magazine.

Invariably address, GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New-York*.

:o:

STANDING RULES FOR WRITERS FOR THIS MAGAZINE.

1. Each writer is required to state his own views on the topic he takes up, without a direct personal controversy with any other writer in our columns. This course does not restrict liberty of expression on any topics others have presented, but is designed to save personal feelings.

2. Each individual correspondent is *alone* responsible for the sentiments of his article: the fact of the insertion is not to be construed as an approval by the EDITOR.

3. The main object of this Magazine, as expressed on its cover, must be kept in view by all writers: other topics may, however, sometimes be admitted, if space will allow.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS:

FOR SALE AT THE BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

On all books and pamphlets, sent by mail, the postage has to be *pre-paid*. The following works will be sent, any distance under 3000 miles, postage free, on receipt of the retail price; except the *bound* EXAMINERS.

SIX SERMONS on the inquiry, *Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering?* To which is added a sermon on *Christ the Life-giver*, or the faith of the Gospel; by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*; with an Introduction defending the Bible and its Author against Infidels. This work contains double the amount of matter of the original Six Sermons. *Price* in plain binding, 50 cents; in paper covers, 30 cents.

THE WATCH TOWER: OR, MAN IN DEATH; *and the Hope for a Future Life.*—A Pamphlet of 96 pages. A thorough cure for the modern *necromancy*, misnamed "*spiritualism*," which is really *animalism*. *Price*, 20 cents.

LIFE FROM THE DEAD; or, *The Righteous only will live again*. By the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. The author believes this subject is one of vast importance. It illustrates the whole Gospel scheme, and shows the mercy of God in its true light, while man is seen to be wholly mortal. It cuts up the modern *man-worship*, which is hurrying so many on to rank atheism. *Price*, 20 cents.

LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.—This embraces the whole of the three previous named works, and the Tract on Atonement, bound in one volume of 360 pages, and lettered on the back. It contains a full view of the doctrine of "*No life out of Christ*," as held by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price*, $1.

MAN'S DESTINY.—*Immortality*: The Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D.D., St. Louis, Mo., *Reviewed* by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. A very valuable work. *Price*, in pamphlet, 30 cents.

BIBLE VS. TRADITION: in which the True Teaching of the Bible is manifested: showing the true meaning of the terms *Soul, Spirit, Hell, Everlasting, Eternity, Life, Death*, &c. An invaluable help to understanding the Scriptures. *Price*, bound, 75 cents. A cheap edition, in paper covers, 40 cents.

OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN.—This work was written by Prof. WILSON, England, some years since. We republished it, believing it could not fail to interest all thinking men, whatever might be thought of the accuracy of its positions. For ourself, we indorse the general theory that the *Anglo-Saxons* are the literal descendants of Israel, in the line of Joseph and Ephraim. Price, 50 cents, in paper covers only.

BIBLE EXAMINER *bound*; Vol. 13, $1.75. Vol. 14, $1.85. This includes the postage: $1.50 each without the postage.

TRACTS AND SMALL WORKS.

MAN'S NATURE AND DESTINY; or, the Animal man and the Spiritual man. A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 5 cents.

LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN; or, Life only through Christ, not a heresy; by Dr. J. K. FINLEY, Pittsburgh, Pa. *Price*, 5 cents.

THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM; by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price*, 7 cents.

THE ATONEMENT: by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 3 cents.

DOOM OF THE UNGODLY; or, *The Wicked Dead remain eternally under death's dominion*. A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 5 cents.

Other Tracts will be added, if funds are to be had.

Orders for any of these works may be left with GEO. W. YOUNG, 35 Ann-St., New York.

All *Letters* sent by mail, must be addressed,

GEO. STORRS, *Box 4658, New York.*

Vol. XV. PUBLISHED MONTHLY. 1863.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES."—Jesus.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR.

TERMS:
One Dollar per Vol. of 384 Pages. Single Numbers, of 32 Pages, 15 Cts.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR:
POST OFFICE ADDRESS, BOX 4659,
NEW-YORK.

Contents of the June Number.

1. "TO LIVE OR NOT TO LIVE." A Criticism by the Editor, 161
2. CHRONOLOGY AND PROPHETIC EVENTS,..... 184
3. RE-LIVING OF THE WICKED DEAD. A Suggestion. By S. D. Beegle,..... 188
4. BOSTON,..... 192

REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS TO EXAMINER.

RUFUS WENDELL, *Salem*, Mass
JOSEPH T, CURRY, *Springfield*, Mass.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"THIS IS THE RECORD, THAT GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, AND THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON. HE THAT HATH THE SON, HATH LIFE; AND HE THAT HATH NOT THE SON, HATH NOT LIFE."

Vol. 15. No. 6.] **JUNE, 1863.** [Whole No. 225.

"TO LIVE OR NOT TO LIVE."

A CRITICISM BY THE EDITOR.

Under the above head *Eld.* D. T. TAYLOR, formerly one of the most respected and able men among the class of people called *Adventists*, has entered the field against those who hold there will be no reliving of the wicked dead. If Eld. T.'s name had not appeared as the author of the four articles in the "*World's Crisis*," no one acquainted with him would have believed *such* an emanation ever could flow from his mind: it certainly looks *just like* the ebullition of the mind of "somebody else." He opens by saying:—

"My pen won't stay idle any longer, though, in taking it up to overhaul this matter, I stand a chance of having a stream of human wrath and sophistical criticism poured on my devoted head for nine months, as somebody else has had."

Is the Elder charitable in these remarks? It seems to us he is far removed from his usual chaste and kind manner. Who has poured "human wrath" on any one's head in this controversy, at all? The charge is simply monstrous; and, we trust, he will yet see it so. Saith Eld. T.—

"I don't love controversy, but I am driven to it. The error is so rampant, and yet so devoid of common sense, that my spirit is stirred within me. It writes itself."

The Elder seems not to act with his usual liberty: he is "driven" to the work. Then he has no reward to look for. Paul said, "If I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will" *** "what is my reward then?" No man should allow himself to be "driven" into controversy: he will

surely show that it is his *own* "spirit" that has moved him, without telling his readers so. But how strange that a topic "so devoid of common sense" should have aroused Eld. T. so amazingly! Did he think "common sense" had left every body but himself, and he must come forth to revive it in others? Ah, but "the error is so rampant"—is growing so fast and rank! Truly that is cause of alarm! But no one who has any "common sense" can possibly be injured by it! Pray, keep cool, Eld. Why do you make haste to battle?

"I enter the polemical arena to combat—not a doctrine, but a notion. It does not rise to the dignity of a doctrine of the church, nor shall I be guilty of calling it one."

The Eld. is after "a notion!" Why does a king in Israel follow such a phantasma? Is he likely to overtake it? If he does, will he demolish it? If so, what great exploit has he performed? Killed "a notion!" Don Quixote's battle with a wind-mill was not so wild an undertaking, nor quite so visionary as the exploit to which our Eld. sets himself.

After the first paroxysm of indignation by the Eld. in which he seems to say, like his brother prophet, "I do well to be angry," he proceeds:—

"Among the things worth noticing in this connection is this: the notion has no history in the Christian church. It is a novelty."

Did Eld. T. notice this same fact, if it be a fact—which we deny—in regard to the non-immortality of man and the unconcious state of the dead? both of which "notions" he has embraced as truth!

The doctrine which he calls "a notion" *has* a "history in the Christian church." The doctrine is, that the saints *only* have a revival into life from the dead. The early Christians spoke only of the revival of such. In the *Crisis*, where Eld. T.'s articles appeared, and in one of the same numbers, is an article from C. F. Hudson, relating to the fable of the Phœnix, in which he says—

"The fable was sometimes employed by the early Christians as an argument for the resurrection. Clement of Rome regards the bird as specially designed for an emblem of that event, and says: 'Why, therefore, should we esteem it a great matter, and wonderful, that the Creator of all things should raise up *all those who have* SERVED HIM HOLILY, since by a bird he manifests to us the magnificence of HIS PROMISE.'"

Two things are distinctly marked in this item of "history in the Christian Church," 1st. The revival from death was based on God's *promise* and was a matter of promise. 2nd. It embraced only those "who have serv ed Him holily." This is a stubborn piece of "history" for Eld. T. Again, Bishop Kip's researches among the Catacombs, or burying-places of the early Christians, shows they regarded life from the dead as belonging to the saints *alone*, and that the wicked dead would never be revived. The following inscription shows this:

"*If any shall violate this Sepulchre, Let him perish miserably, and remain unburied,; Let him lie down,* AND NOT RISE AGAIN*; Let his portion be with Judas.*"

Thus is Eld. T.'s assumption of "no history," &c. disproved; his first pillar crumbles to the dust, and his following question, *viz:* "Who, in all antiquity, denied the resurrection to life of the wicked dead?" is squarely met, and we retort—"Who, in all antiquity" *taught* "the resurrection *to life* of the wicked dead?" *Where*, till Christianity was corrupted by fables, was such a doctrine promulgated? Plainly, nowhere "in God's church or out of it." "So" Eld. T.'s "brand" comes back to its author: the revival "to life of the wicked dead" is a "dogma of mere human invention," like that other papal monstrosity, or "Roman dunghill decretal, the soul is immortal;" to use the language of Luther. Says Eld. T.

"I wonder what hobby, of man's invention, will next be saddled and mounted, for some pugilistic novice to ride Jehu-like through our ecclesiastical ranks! Churches in order and union clear the track!"

How much there is in this outburst of amazement from a "pugilistic novice" who has just entered on the discussion of a "notion," we cannot say. Some of those to whom the reproach seems to be aimed, have as many "gray hairs" as himself, and fought the battle single handed and alone, and at their own pecuniary expense, against the dogma of an inherent immortality and eternal torment, before Eld. T. began to read the alphabet on the life theme, tho' he now embraces so much of the *hobby* as relates to immortality only as the gift of God and the final cessation of the being of the wicked. "Churches in order and in union" in those early days did *not* "clear the track," but the truth of God cleared its own track—so it is like to do again; and churches of whatever "order," will find that

it will take something more than sneers and ridicule to stop the car of truth.

We pass over entirely, for the present, Eld. T.'s string of *flings*, which occupy an entire column of the *Crisis*, and only ask our readers to take our work, "LIFE FROM THE DEAD," and compare it, item by item, with the Eld.'s short method of disposing of matters not convenient to meet squarely. One small error in his quotation of Scripture we call his attention to, because he has twice quoted the text in that paragraph incorrectly. He has made Paul say, Rom. 2 : 16, that God shall "judge the secrets of ALL men by Jesus Christ." The word *all* is not in the text, and the context plainly shows that it relates only to men to whom Christ has been preached; "for as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law," and of course are not embraced in the class whose secrets are to be judged by "Jesus Christ, *according to my gospel.*" The gospel, or good news of Christ, and life from the dead is that which, instrumentally, judges the secrets of men, wherever it is preached: "in the day" of the preaching of that gospel, men's characters and doom are decided: the secrets of their hearts are revealed by its power; they "contradict and blaspheme"—despise and reject Christ, or accept Him as their DELIVERER. A perfect revelation is made of each heart where the gospel is preached in its simplicity and purity. Said Jesus "For judgment I am come into this world; that they which see not might see; and that they which see, might be made blind." John 9 : 39. Thus the secrets of men were being judged and made manifest and their doom fixed as the gospel was preached to them. The thoughts men entertain of Jesus Christ where He is made known, reveal their true character and fix their final state. "This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will RAISE HIM *up at the last day.*" John 6 : 40. This language shows who will be revived into life by a resurrection; and it clearly excludes all rejecters of Jesus Christ. There is no revival of dead men except by *promise*, and there is no promise except to those who believe in Jesus where He is preached.

Eld. T. in speaking of the seven men and one woman, Mark 12 : 23, 25, asks—"Is it certain these characters were not wicked?" We reply, It is certain they were all righteous in the estimation of the Sadducees, because the seven men had strictly conformed to the law in severally marrying this woman: and if Eld. T. will have it that our Saviour's words, in vr. 25, "when they shall rise from the dead," proves that all seven of them would be raised from the dead, then we answer his question boldly, *It is certain* none of them were "wicked," for Jesus adds, "they" *** "are *as the angels of God in heaven.*" Eld. T., why did you try to put darkness for light by introducing that case? We can excuse you: for with such barrenness of proof of the reliving of the wicked you called to your aid a text which condemns yourself.

Eld. T. asks, "How punish the men who are totally dead, and to remain so forever?"

Eld. T. believes in the "*eternal* punishment" of the wicked, or he does not believe the Bible: yet he holds the wicked will not live eternally. We retort on him, "How punish the men who are totally dead, and to remain so forever?" Does he answer, "as death is their punishment, and they are to remain under it forever, their punishment is eternal." *Exactly so.*—*Death*, and not dying, is their punishment: hence when dead, if they are *penally* excluded from a revival they are punished, and that punishment is eternal.

Eld. T. opens his SECOND article as follows:

"Death to the wicked an eternal sleep! A very pleasing consideration this for incorrigible sinners."

You forget that was the very cry of "orthodoxy" when you embraced the doctrine that literal destruction was the end of the wicked. They too cried "French infidelity" as loud and as persistent as you do this day; but we outlived that cry and so we doubtless shall yours. If men had rather die like brutes than have life through and by Christ, how can you help it?—The word of truth is a savor of life unto life to some, and of death unto death to others. Can we mend it so that all will embrace the life-way? If a little future torture is salutary in bringing men to life, why not accept the largest amount claimed by "orthodoxy?" If a little is so good, as you think, how much better must be the larger dose, which you reject! But our *Eld.* waxes warm as he proceeds. He says:

"The implacable and obstinate errorist is to be rebuked sharply and t horoughly, lest his poison contaminate the body."

Well now, who is judge as to this matter of error? Is Eld. T., all at once, exalted to the seat as *umpire* in the case? If so, who exalted him? By whose authority was he placed there? If God has done it, let the Eld. show his credentials. If men have done it, let us know by what authority they have acted? If he has exalted himself to the awful seat, God will in due time abase him. Who is an "implacable and obstinate errorist" if not the man who lifts up himself as umpire, uncalled and uncommissioned of God? Is he a Christian? So am I. Is he a minister of Jesus Christ? So am I. Is he in possession of the right to give his thoughts and convictions of the true sense and meaning of the words of God? *So am I.* Have I no right to denounce those who differ from *me* as "implacable and obstinate errorists?" No more has he. *Man*, who made *you* judge or ruler over other's faith? Controvert other's views you may; but to denounce them as "implacable and obstinate errorists," while they believe in Jesus and accept Him as their life, you nor any other man or body of men cannot do and be guiltless before God, in my judgment. Why, "you know not what manner of spirit ye are of;" to "our own master we stand or fall:" but you say—

"If the views I oppose are pernicious in their tendency, radically unsound, and ruinous in their influence on evil men, I shall not forget that the loving Christ once said: 'Ye serpents—wo unto you!'"

"*If:*" that is well put in. Who is to decide whether the views you oppose are "unsound," &c.? You may decide for yourself; but that does not prove the decision is not wrong, for you are not infallible. You have no authority to call us "serpents," and cry, "wo unto you!" because Jesus, who was truth itself and knew all men, and "knew what was in man," once thus addressed the hypocrites around Him. Do not deceive thyself by supposing you are heaven-authorized to do likewise, lest the measure you have meeted to others may be meeted to you again.

"I love everybody, but love won't buy my silence when the Word of God is assailed. I court no mortal's smiles—fear no mortal's frowns," saith the Elder.

We are glad you are brave, but Jehu once said, "Come see my zeal for the Lord," when it was quite evident some other motive influenced his conduct. It is easy to misunderstand the

influences that some times control our actions. You assume, we who hold some men, who are dead, will never live again, "assail the Word of God." Do you *know* such to be the fact? Do you cleave to the Word of God? So do we. Do you make that word the standard of appeal? So do we. Do you claim the right to construe it according to your understanding? So do we. Do you claim the right to preach and print your views of the Word of God? So do we. Do you claim to adhere to that word as authority in all matters of faith and practice?—Are we a whit behind you in this respect? But say you—

"All the old, long-established doctrines of a future judgment and Gehenna-fire for living, guilty sinners, are thrust aside, to give place to a notion of yesterday's birth, now persistently pressed upon our churches."

This sentence contains several inaccuracies. 1. It does not set aside a future judgment for "*living* sinners." 2. The Bible "doctrine of Gehenna-fire" is, that *dead* sinners, and not "*living*" ones, only, are the subjects of this fire. "Fear Him, which *after* He hath *killed*, hath power to cast into hell"—*gehenna*.—Luke 12: 5. So, you mistake in this matter. Again Eld. T. says—

"Paul saith: Men die once—after that the judgment. Judgment for whom? I answer, For all who die,—for the very men who die. Death and judgment are 'appointed' for each and all. And from that judgment the risen wicked dead, made alive, go away to die 'the second death.'"

Here is a strange mixture of truth and error. Let us hear what Paul did say—"As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this"—*appointment*—"the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation;" or, as the Syriac has it—"*for their life.*" Who *live* at the second appearing of Christ? "*Them* that *look* for him." Then the others are excluded from life, and are not made alive, as Eld. T. affirms. Look at the text again. "It is *appointed* unto men *once* to die." "After *this*" appointment "the judgment." God appointed death once, and only *one* death: after this appointment He institutes the judgment, or *trial* of each individual in his probationary state, which was to decide who should live again: and He caused the proclamation to be made of life through Christ to them who would accept it as a gift in Him.

To give this life, He is coming again, and will give it to those, and to such only as "*look* for Him." At that hour all others are condemned to *abide* in death and "*not see life.*" Such we regard as the true sense of "the Word of God." Paul has no *two* deaths in his statement of the matter, and he will not suffer himself to be corrected by even so worthy a personage as Eld. T. Our worthy opponent next resorts to the book of Revelation, and says—

"The dead 'stand' before God. How stand without life? Do corpses stand? By what supernatural process are the dead galvanized into an erect posture, while dead as a door-nail? O, they are so 'represented,' that's all. As well might one contend that, when the dead hear, and the blind see, their hearing and sight are not restored, as to affirm that, when the dead stand they are not restored to conscious life."

The Eld.'s logic here is not new, but it limps just as it always did. There is no analogy in his illustration. If John had said, I saw the dead *alive*, then the analogy would avail something, possibly. He said, I saw the dead *stand:* not, I saw them alive. But how could they stand, "while dead as a door-nail?" Eld. T. perhaps can answer his question by making the experiment of making "a door-nail" stand. We have made many such nails stand in "an erect posture" even without the help of *galvanism.* But seriously. Will Eld. T. turn to Isa. 14, and tell us how, when the king of Babylon went down to hell—*sheol*—hell stirred up "the dead" to "meet" him "at his coming," and set them to talking, saying, "Art thou also become weak as we?" &c., if at the same time they were not alive? for, saith the Eld. "(bear in mind, 'the dead know not anything')" and so they could not talk as they did unless they were alive! Will he now say, "O, they are so 'represented,' that's all"? Does not the Eld. see his logic or his theology is in fault? Surely any one else can if he cannot. The constant resort to the allegorical book of Revelation by the advocates of future torment for the wicked shows the weakness of their position in a most marked manner. They spell their lessons backward, and make the allegory teach the doctrines which cannot be sustained by one "Thus saith the LORD." Eld. T. says—

"Christ says, without respect to character, 'The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.'"

Did Eld. T. intend to blind the minds of his readers by this

statement? Did he not know that the word *hear*, in this text, is used in two different senses? To hear frequently has the sense of "to listen to; to attend to; to *obey*," in Scripture as well as in other writings. Thus the prophet says, "*Hear* and your soul shall live." The word "dead," also, has a figurative use in Scripture; as "She that liveth in pleasure is *dead* while she liveth." Now look at the language of Jesus, so mangled by Eld. T., "The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God:"—this gospel of life shall be preached to sinners "*dead* in trespasses and sins," for the "obedience of faith among all nations"—"and they that hear" —*obey* it—"shall live." Is this saying "without respect to character" that all who "*hear shall live*"? The use of this text, for the purpose it has been used, is a most palpable error; but we will not call them "ye serpents," and cry "Wo unto you": we would rather say, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do." Eld. T. next says—

"The palpable erroneousness of this theory is seen in its whittling down, in effect, the judgment to come,—the day of wrath; gloom and distress, the fiery indignation, the tribulation to come, on the men who troubled the churches eighteen centuries ago, and who most obviously are the very ones to be punished with everlasting destruction at the epoch of Christ's flaming advent," &c.

Our Eld. has here made a statement not so easy to reconcile with after statements in the same article. He says—

"The unholy dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished:"*** "The good will *revive* at his coming; the wicked will *revive* a thousand years after."

"Two and two make four" is an obvious truth; but that the "men who troubled the churches eighteen centuries ago, are the *very ones* to be punished with everlasting destruction *at the epoch* of Christ's flaming advent," and yet not be alive, or "*revive*" till "*a* THOUSAND years *after*" that advent, may be very clear to Eld. T., but is not so clear to us who try to learn at the fountain of truth and life. But says the Elder—

"If it be supposed that this wrath refers, not to sinners who shall have died, but, rather, to those who are found alive at the coming of the last day, then where would be the *equality* in the divine administration, and infliction of wrath, punishment, justice and judgment on the two classes, provided this were so?"

Our Saviour has provided the answer to this inquiry, Math. 23: 35, 36, speaking of the wickedness of that people in per-

secuting and killing the Lord's prophets, &c., He says, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar: verily, I say unto you, ALL *these things* shall come on THIS *generation*."

Can the Eld. see where "the *equality* in the divine administration and infliction of wrath" was in this case? one generation, then living, having to bear "*all* these things," while the previous wicked, who were dead, were left undisturbed. The grand principle is this—When wickedness reaches a climax, under any dispensation, then comes the *executive* judgment, which closes the age, and the *execution* falls on the then living wicked, who have by their exceeding wickedness taken on themselves all the sins of those who had gone before them, and the righteous judgment of God meets out to them accordingly: "all these things shall come on *this* generation:" but none of the wicked dead were made alive to share in those tribulations: "they" were "dead, they shall *not live;* they are deceased, they shall not rise." Isa. 26 : 14. Eld. T. goes on—

"I look upon this view as being the most serious defection from the true faith that has ever obtained among us since we first had an ecclesiastical existence;—a view most obnoxious to the evangelical portion of the church, and one that saps the very foundations of the doctrine of a 'judgment to come' and retribution for sin;—a view which, once received by the ungodly, who place no value on eternal life, would lead them recklessly to say, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Behold the tree and its legitimate fruit."

So the Eld. is "orthodox," "evangelical," and of "the true faith;" at least in his own estimation. He talks precisely as the self-styled "orthodox" and "evangelicals" talked when we first advocated immortality only as the gift of God to the righteous, and from which the wicked were excluded; but the Eld. advanced into that doctrine by the help of the eye-salve of truth; and another touch of the same ointment may help him to "see clearly" that life from the dead is as really a gift of God's grace, bestowed *only* on the righteous, as that immortality is. It will be no more marvellous if he is converted to the latter truth, than that he was converted to the former one.—They are *twin* doctrines, and nothing but death to both can separate them, or make them void. They stand or fall together.

If "the ungodly" are led by these truths to say, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," who can help their mad choice? Neither the future misery, or eternal misery doctrine, holds these "reckless" sinners back from giving loose to their love of this present life and its sensual indulgences: and we fear these "torment" doctrines are contributing more to the mad career of reckless sinners than all other errors that ever disgraced the church. They serve to beget a reckless spirit by their presentation of the character of God in such light as to becloud the grand and glorious truth, "GOD IS LOVE," and lead thinking men to conclude, it is vain to try to please such a being as the torment doctrine represents Him to be, and so rush madly and "recklessly" into every indulgence of sense while they may. "Behold the tree and its legitimate fruit"! Again the Eld. says—

"It is claimed to be exceedingly strange that the second death, if it ever prove a fact instead of a fable, is never spoken of anywhere but in the book of Revelation." * * * "Isn't God to be believed when he says a thing *once*? Shall we doubt him, and try to explain his words away (especially when those *words* are the *explanations* of symbols), because he don't repeat and reiterate those words? If God is God, is not one statement as good as twenty? Who says it isn't?"

Has the Eld. been candid in this extract? The question is not, is God's speaking "once" sufficient? but, has God spoken *at all* what you say? Or, again: as the phrase "second death" occurs no where in the Bible except in the allegorical book of Revelation, are we not shut up to that book, so far as the Bible is to decide what is the true meaning of the phrase? Eld. T. is not to *assume* he has the sole right to determine its import, and then charge us with calling in question the veracity of God, because we reject Eld. T.'s application of the phrase! Nor is he to assume, without proof and against facts, that the phrase "second death" is an "*explanation* of symbols." The only explanation of the phrase is given in verse 14 of the 20th chapter. "Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire: *this* is the second death." Now, whatever else is embraced in the phrase, it does not embrace the idea of dying twice: for "death and hell" did not die twice, nor die at all except symbollically.—Revelation then being its own interpreter, the second death implies only such destruction as precludes a recovery: thus

death and hell were destroyed, and thus every impenitent unbeliever is destroyed who dies in his sins and lives no more.—For outside proof on this point we quote some extracts from Prof. Hudson's "Debt and Grace," in relation to how the Jews understood it.

"We learn from this place (Num. 14 : 37) that they *died* the second death."—"They shall die the second death and *shall not live* in the world *to come*."—"They shall die the second death, so as *not to enter* into the world *to come*."—"Every idolater, who says there is another God besides me, I will slay with the second death, from which no man can come to life again." Hudson also gives the "statement of Julius Africanus (A. D. 221) that 'Adam being one hundred and thirty years old begat Seth; and living thereafter eight hundred years he died, to wit, the SECOND DEATH."

It was a death from which there was no release; and those who died this death "*shall not enter the world to come*," or age to come; hence will not be revived from the dead "*at the last day*."

"Isn't God to be believed, when he says a thing only *once?*" asks the Elder. We answer, He undoubtedly is. Is the Elder willing to abide this test? Has not God spoken more than once, of some wicked ones, "They are dead, *they shall not live:* they are deceased, *they shall not rise*"? See Isa. 26 : 14 and Ps. 49. "If God is God, is not *one* statement as good as twenty?" asks Eld. T., and he adds, "Who says it isn't?" The reply of Nathan to David is singularly appropriate here—"THOU *art the man*"!—But he goes on—

"Just exactly as it is said in the N. T., that 'the Law' is done away in Christ, without distinguishing either ceremonal or moral, but including and meaning both, so it is also declared that the dead, speaking in general terms, shall live again; no distinction being made of character, the good and bad being both included. 'God is —the God—of the living; for ALL (will) live unto him.' *Boothroyd*, 'ALL live to him.' *Thompson*, 'To him, they are ALL alive.' Lk. 20 : 27–38."

Wonder if Eld. T. is not now a convert to the *conscious* state of the dead? It seems so; he talks so exactly as they do.—What does Jesus say of those "all" who "(will) live unto him?" He says, "they are the *children* of God, being the children of the resurrection," and "neither can *they die* any more." Did Eld. T. really mean to sweep into the broad stream of universal

salvation, for fear he could not otherwise secure the resurrection of the wicked? So it is, one error begets another, just as one truth evolves another.

Our Saviour makes a clear distinction between the righteous and the wicked in this text. "God is not the God of the dead," who are to live no more, but "those who are accounted *worthy* to obtain that world and the resurrection of the dead" *** "are the children of God"***"ALL" such "live to him;" or, in His purpose and *promise;* as when He said to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob:" that declaration affirmed a relation between God and these men which was a pledge of their resurrection—*they* "ALL live to Him." What has this to do with wicked men, who have no such relation to God, and to whom God has made no such pledge? Will Eld. T. take *the* "*children's* bread and cast it to dogs"? Alas, that through the force of prejudice or misapprehension he should seem to make an effort to do so. May infinite wisdom and love yet remove the scales from his eyes.

On the text, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," Eld. T. says it "is better" to "render it *by* Christ," and adds—

"Only the good are ever in Christ,' or can awake in him. The evil are to 'hear his voice' and live, but not in Christ, nor to immortality or eternal life. But be it remembered that the *all* who are to come to life by Christ, is the exact *all* who died by Adam, i. e., the whole race." *** "Let God be true."

And "be it remembered" also, that "THE DEAD *are raised* INCORRUPTIBLE," and Eld. T. says, the wicked dead are not to "live to immortality;" yet Paul declares "*the dead* are raised *incorruptible*"! Has Eld. T.'s "brains" now "got puzzled in estimating the difference between six and half a dozen?" Will he tell us the exact difference between "immortality" and "incorruptibility"? If there is none, shall not we "Let God be true," even if Eld. T. is found to be mistaken? Though the word "all IN Christ" is not agreeable to him, nor reconcileable with his theory, it is, nevertheless, the truth, that the raised dead are "incorruptible"—that they are "raised *in glory*"—"raised *in power*"—"raised a spiritual body:" and he will please "remember," it is "*the dead*" that are thus raised; so that if "the exact *all* who died in Adam" are embraced in the

dead raised "*by* Christ," the same *all* are glorified, and do not and "cannot die any more."

Eld. T. quotes Rev. 20 : 5, thus, "The unholy 'dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished'"; he remarks on the text—

"It is worthy of note the same form of the Greek verb *anazao*, used here to set forth the reliving of the unholy and unblessed dead, is rendered 'revived' in the following passage" *** "Christ both died and rose, and *revived*." *** "Is it any wonder, the advocates of the 'non-re-living of the wicked' want to get rid of this passage of Revelation? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Doubtless the Elder knows his last remark is true from experience. Even this doubtful text will not work in his harness till he has attached his *gloss* to it. He quotes it, not as it stands—"*The rest* of the dead," &c., but "The *unholy* dead," &c. Was the text too *sharp* to meet squarely? Who are "the *rest* of the dead"? and what is the death they are in? These are points not to be assumed. We do not allow the Elder, or any other man, to do this for us. Suppose it be a literal resurrection, is it certain it is "the *unholy* dead"? Certainly, it is not. The living of those in the previous verse, embraced only such as "were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." Does this include all that are righteous, of every age and class? Clearly, it does not; it is only the martyrs for Christ and the word of God. Is there no revival from the dead for other saints and virtuous heathen? Yes, but "they lived not again until" a later period. Is not our gloss as good, at least, as Eld. T.'s? We think it is; and that we construe it as fairly as he does, without being anxious "to get rid of it."—That the text is a doubtful one, Elder T. might have known, if he had used his eyes in reading the *Syriac* version of the N. T., from which he has made an occasional quotation. The text, the Eld. thinks so troublesome to us, is not found in the *Syriac* at all; and Prof. Murdock says, The Syriac version is "the oldest version of the N. T. in any language." This version, however, was copied, originally, from some early Greek version, though not now to be found; but its not being in the Syriac is evidence it was not in the early Greek; and this text is not found in the

best Vatician or Moscow editions; *i. e.*, in neither the Latin or Greek church; and Matthaei, who, Bishop Middleton said, has given us the best version of the Greek N. T. of any man, put the text in his first edition in brackets as doubtful, and in his second edition he struck it out as *spurious*. If such a text can help Eld. T., and those of his theory, he is welcome to it, and all the credit arising from its use, especially when there is not another text of like character in the Bible.

Elder T. opens his THIRD article with a sort of apology for speaking so severely against us; and to justify himself he says—

"Paul said, of less objectionable teachers, 'Rebuke them sharply [i. e., with severity], that they may be sound in the faith.'"

Let us see who these "less objectionable teachers" were of whom Paul spake. He thus describes them, Titus 1 : 10–13, "For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision : whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply," &c.

Such were the "*less* objectionable teachers" Eld. T. speaks of! We know, now, how he estimates those who differ from him on the resurrection question—they are worse than those who "*are always liars*," &c. No wonder he thinks he does "well to be angry" with such reprobates; but yet one may query, who gave him authority to "*judge*" us, "and set at naught" another's servants? Who gave him this authority? Says the Elder—

"I think Paul told the ministry to do this."

Ah! and who are "the ministry"? Are you a minister? So am *I*, and a number of years your senior both in age and in the ministry. Have you regarded the apostolical injunction, "*Rebuke not an elder*, but entreat him as a father"? Have you acted in obedience to Paul, in this matter? I leave the answer to yourself before God.

Says Eld. T., "Some men possess the wonderful power to make error look just like truth."

Those must be "wonderful" men! Certainly, Eld. T. is not one of them. His errors are so palpable, in this controversy, that he is clear from that class of men.

But "we are bored almost to death," says Elder T.

We can tell you a cure for that, Elder. "Let the peace of God, that passeth all understanding, keep your heart and mind through Christ Jesus," and do not think all the church are "big-headed religious babies" except yourselves; nor that Christ has committed the government of His church exclusively to you. "Let your moderation be known to all men: the Lord is at hand." "In your patience possess ye your souls."

The Eld. says—"If Rev. 20: 13 teaches any thing, then, without a shadow of doubt, it teaches that, in God's own time, all the dead, in the sea, in Death, and in Hades, will again come to life."

Supposing we should say, "If" Isa. 26: 14, "teaches any thing, then, without a shadow of a doubt, it teaches that," certain wicked persons there spoken of, "are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, *they shall not rise*"; would a thoughtful man conclude we had fully proved the fact of the non-living again of some of the wicked dead? Now Isa. 26: 14 teaches something, and the presumption is, in the absence of positive testimony to the contrary, that it does teach some wicked dead men will not live again: especially as the language is not figurative, symbolical, nor doubtful as to its meaning.

That Rev. 20: 13 teaches something is an undoubted truth: but is Eld. T. authorized to tell us, if it does not mean what he thinks, it does not mean anything? When, and by whom was he constituted an *infallible* expounder of symbols and allegories? Why does he reject the "orthodox" interpretation of eternal torment, so clearly expressed Rev. 20: 10, and not admit the most literal sense of that text, and yet insist upon the most literal construction of verse 13? His principles in his exposition of this verse, should, it seems to us, lead him to embrace the doctrine of the eternal torment of the Devil, and along with him, other wicked beings.

That Rev. 20: 13 does not teach the reliving of the wicked dead, is certainly as clear as that the 10th verse does not teach the eternal torment of any one; and more clear, from the fact the 13th verse does not affirm the reliving of the wicked, but employs language of a symbolical and figurative character, such as is used in Isa. 14, where hell—*sheol*—is represented as "stirring up the dead" in it, and causing to be "raised up from their

thrones all the kings of the nations," and "they shall all speak" to the fallen king of Babylon, who had come down among them, and say, "Art thou also become weak as we?" &c. Now, Eld. T. does not believe those dead kings knew anything, and yet they are "raised up" and "talk." If here is no proof—in this language—of life, neither is there any in the language of Rev. 20: 13, which is not even as strong as Isa. 14. For further remarks on Rev. 20: 13 see our work, "LIFE FROM THE DEAD." We trust our friends will see the importance of giving that work a wide circulation at this time. Elder T. has several flings at it, but has not presumed to "*feel its* PILLARS:" its foundation principles are untouched by him and all other writers on his side the question. Eld. T. asks—

"Did any body ever hear of the resurrection of a dead man, whether good or bad, that did not come to life? If so, where is the privile ged individu al?"

Did any body ever hear of the resurrection of a *bad* man, that was dead? "If so, where is the privileged individual?"

"Was the son of the Shunamite woman, the widows' sons at Sarepta and Nain, truly good? Prove it."

You affirm that *bad* men are raised from the dead. We deny it, and you call upon us to prove that certain persons raised were good! No: it is for *you* to prove any of them were *bad*. Can you do it? You know you cannot; and you hide your lack of argument by calling on us to prove a negative! Eld. T. refers to Heb. 11: 35, where it is said, "Women received their dead raised to life again," and refers to Elisha's raising to life the widow's son, and he says—

"It is thus shown that it was, *possibly*, a graceless young man who experienced the *anastasis*, or resurrection. And *if* God has raised two wicked men to life, he can others, without being under the necessity of making that life eternal."

"If" and "possibly": we italicised those two words in the extract, that the reader might see to what straits the Eld. is driven. He has nothing more on which to build than a "*possibly*" and an "*if*," and these crippled limbs will hardly stand the shock of "they are dead, they shall not live: they are deceased, they shall not rise." "*If* God has raised two wicked men," &c. "*Prove it*," Eld. T. *Ifs* do not stand in this battle. The

"women who received their dead to life again" did it *"by faith:"* and it is not for you to *assume* such mothers had wicked sons! Again we say, "Prove it." As to God's *power* to raise the wicked dead, we have no more doubt than you. It is not a question of power, but of fact, of revelation, of promise, or of threat. That question staggers you at every step, and you have to use *if* and *possibly*, and assume, because you have not a single plain testimony of the wicked dead's *living* again, such as we have a right to demand, if it is a part of the penalty of transgression.—"The wages of sin is *death:"* that is plain and unequivocal. Show us in equally plain terms that the wages of sin is to relive from the dead, with torment after, and another death. Thus far you have utterly failed in my judgment. But says Eld. T.—

"The sinner reaps, for his sowing, a corruptible body,—he rises up as he lies down." Gal. 6: 8."

About as accurate as usual. The text you refer to grinds to powder your whole theory. "He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap *corruption,"* saith Paul. Not "a corruptible body": that is *not* corruption. A corruptible body may have life in it: but *corruption* has no life; it excludes, utterly, all life; and this text settles the fact that "corruption," and not life in any form, is what those reap who live after the flesh: they go to corruption, and that is their eternal portion. Says the Eld.,

"The proof that wicked men are to revive again in the judgment, lies in the scriptural assertions that they are to have a resurrection to life."

And yet Eld. T. with all his labor has not given us one "Scriptural assertion that" the wicked dead "have a resurrection *to life"!* He has assumed it, and he has *inferred* it, but not one "Thus saith the LORD" has he given in all his labor, while he has set aside more than one testimony that some of the wicked dead *"shall not rise":* and his strongest text from which he has drawn his inference, John 5: 29, binds him down to the fact that they, and they *only*, "who have done *good"* come "unto the resurrection *of life";* while they that "have done evil" come not to this resurrection, but "unto the resurrection of *condemnation";* to *what?* Let John the Baptist tell you, "He that believeth not the Son of God *shall not see life*, but the wrath of God *abideth* on him." Ch. 3: 36. Thus we see, only those who have done good come to the "resurrection of life," while the evil

doers are condemned, at the resurrection hour, *not to see life*, but to have the wrath of God *abide* on them.

"Two 'Thus saith the Lord's' are as good as a hundred; the Almighty's *ipse dixit* being good without a voucher or endorser," saith Eld. T.

That is true: but where has God ever said the wicked dead shall "have a resurrection *to life,"* as Eld. T. affirms; and when He has said, they "shall not see life," and Christ has said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have *no life* in you," and said this in direct reference to the resurrection "*at the last* day," whose "*ipse dixit"* shall we receive, God's and His Christ's, or Eld. T.'s? Can any hesitate as to where the truth is?

Eld. T. says, "If the word resurrection does not, in and of itself, assert the reliving of the wicked dead, then it fails to teach the re-living of the holy dead. So the Grand Resurrection is but a *splendid farce!"*

This is the language of despair. If the Eld. cannot prove the reliving of the wicked dead his hope of a future life seems to fail. We will say for his encouragement, we are not dependent on the term resurrection for our hope, useful as that term may be.—That the holy dead shall live again is promised and affirmed in almost all forms of expression—"Because I live ye shall live also."—"I will raise him up at the last day."—"He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."—"The gates of *hades* shall not prevail against my church."—"Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus."—"If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."—"I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." We have given samples enough to show how thoughtless was Eld. T.'s despairing remark, and to comfort his heart that the "Grand Resurrection" will not be "a *splendid farce,"* even though he may not have the gratification of seeing all the millions of the wicked dead restored to life, in all their loathsomeness, and hear their curses and blasphemies; thus making God the great *"Revivalist"* of wickedness: such a *revival*, as one would think would make the cheek of heaven itself *turn pale.* But we forbear to pursue the awful thought of such a scene as Eld. T.'s

theory supposes. We regard it as part and parcel of the endless torment theory; born of the same mother, and doomed to the same overthrow; and may God speed the hour when His glorious name shall no more be blasphemed by such representations of the Divine government, and of the heart of the GOD OF LOVE.

Eld. T.'s FOURTH article opens with a laudatory salutation of the "dear *Crisis*," which we pass. The texts which he introduces to show "that when our Lord comes it will be a *pay-day* for all"—such as, "The Son of man shall come in his glory—and *then* shall he *reward every man* according to his works," we have so fully answered in our work "LIFE FROM THE DEAD," we shall pass with but few words now. Eld. T. says—

"The non-resurrection theory contradicts these passages, and says the wicked dead are reaping their reward,—gone to sleep, never to awake; that's all. Then their going to sleep must be the day of wrath and revelation of God's judgment."

It is Eld. T.'s theory that "contradicts" the first text he quotes; and he contradicts himself also. The text says, "The Son of man shall come in his glory, and THEN"—not a "thousand years after," as he affirms—"shall he *reward* EVERY MAN"—not a *part* of them "*then*," and the others "a thousand years after"! No, Eld., the two legs of your theory are not equal, and it limps badly. "THEN," when He comes, "shall he reward *every man* according to his works." Now Eld. T. will not deny that the *good* are rewarded *then*—at that hour; and by all laws of language, human and divine, the others are also. Hence it is a mere question of what the *reward is*. We affirm, at that hour the doom of the *bad* is equally fixed; and they are rewarded by leaving them under the eternal *dominion* of "death," "the wages of sin," if they are dead at His coming; or *punishing* them "with everlasting destruction" if alive and remaining at that hour. So we justify the text, and Eld. T. condemns it by dividing the *time* of reward. The "going to sleep" of the wicked dead, is not "the day of wrath and revelation of God's judgment"—that day is at Christ's coming, when the judicial judgment is carried out into full *execution* by destroying the living wicked, and causing the wrath of God to *abide* on the wicked dead, so that *they* "shall not see life," but "REMAIN IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE DEAD." Thus "every man" is rewarded "according to his works."

Eld. T. says, "The non-resurrection theory says, in effect, that *hades* is the place of punishment for evil men." *** "Now *gehenna* is not *hades*. The latter is never set forth as the final place of punishment for sin."

Though *hades* is not necessarily the same as *gehenna*, yet hades, or *sheol* its corresponding, word in the Hebrew, is sometimes "set forth as the final place of punishment." Thus Job 24 : 19, "Drought and heat consume the snow waters : so doth the grave"—*sheol*—"those which have sinned." Hence here *sheol* is represented as "the final place of punishment." Again, Psa. 9 : 17, "The wicked shall be turned in *sheol*." Here is an example contradicting Elder T.'s assertion. His school, to prove the wicked dead will live again, this text, should be translated contend the word "*turned*," in it; but if we did, it would "*re*-turned." We do not admit is, in his statement; for it only show how inaccurate the Elder be returned into *sheol*"—Greek, would then read, "the wicked shall *hades*—as "the final place of punishment:" so *hades*, when wicked, is not, in reality, spoken of as the state of the dead, materially different from *gehenna*.

Saith the Eld., "God can and will destroy both soul and body in gehenna-fire, which is no doubt John's lake of fire."

But that "lake of fire" John saw, did not burn up the *devil*, Elder; see Rev. 20 : 10. Do not be in too much haste in your "*no doubts*." The lake of fire in Rev. is never called "*gehenna-fire*"—it is only your *inference*! "That's all."

Eld. T. waxes warm, and he says, his texts are so plain "my opponents are 'reduced to the extremities of solution' to dispose of them.—Accordingly, the plow-share of ruin is got out, and Mr. False-Criticism hitches on his hobby-horse, and drives it through the Book. The passages only mean—a few millions of sinners, who live to see our Lord come; or, it may mean—some dead corpses will be flung into gehenna! That's all."

And did not Jesus say the same thing? Is He "Mr. False-Criticism" who said, "Fear him who, AFTER he hath *killed*, hath power to cast into *gehenna*"? Are here not "dead corpses" to be flung into *gehenna*"? Surely they are not alive when "flung" in. We are right glad to be found in so good company as our blessed Lord. It is frightful to the Elder to think dead corpses should be flung into gehenna! but he is placid as a summer's morn at the idea of making *alive* all dead sinners—most of whom never heard of gehenna, nor of Christ, nor of life

theory supposes. We regard it as part and parcel of the endless torment theory; born of the same mother, and doomed to the same overthrow; and may God speed the hour when His glorious name shall no more be blasphemed by such representations of the Divine government, and of the heart of the GOD OF LOVE.

Eld. T.'s FOURTH article opens with a laudatory salutation of the "dear *Crisis*," which we pass. The texts which he introduces to show "that when our Lord comes it will be a *pay-day* for all"—such as, "The Son of man shall come in his glory—and *then* shall he *reward every man* according to his works," we have so fully answered in our work "LIFE FROM THE DEAD," we shall pass with but few words now. Eld. T. says—

"The non-resurrection theory contradicts these passages, and says the wicked dead are reaping their reward,—gone to sleep, never to awake; that's all. Then their going to sleep must be the day of wrath and revelation of God's judgment."

It is Eld. T.'s theory that "contradicts" the first text he quotes; and he contradicts himself also. The text says, "The Son of man shall come in his glory, and THEN"—not a "thousand years after," as he affirms—"shall he *reward* EVERY MAN"—not a *part* of them "*then*," and the others "a thousand years after"! No, Eld., the two legs of your theory are not equal, and it limps badly. "THEN," when He comes, "shall he reward *every man* according to his works." Now Eld. T. will not deny that the *good* are rewarded *then*—at that hour; and by all laws of language, human and divine, the others are also. Hence it is a mere question of what the *reward is*. We affirm, at that hour the doom of the *bad* is equally fixed; and they are rewarded by leaving them under the eternal *dominion* of "death," "the wages of sin," if they are dead at His coming; or *punishing* them "with everlasting destruction" if alive and remaining at that hour. So we justify the text, and Eld. T. condemns it by dividing the *time* of reward. The "going to sleep" of the wicked dead, is not "the day of wrath and revelation of God's judgment"—that day is at Christ's coming, when the judicial judgment is carried out into full *execution* by destroying the living wicked, and causing the wrath of God to *abide* on the wicked dead, so that *they* "shall not see life," but "REMAIN IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE DEAD." Thus "every man" is rewarded "according to his works."

Eld. T. says, "The non-resurrection theory says, in effect, that *hades* is the place of punishment for evil men." *** "I read of another place, viz.: *gehenna*." *** "Now *gehenna* is not *hades*. The latter is never set forth as the final place of punishment for sin."

Though *hades* is not necessarily the same as *gehenna*, yet hades, or *sheol* its corresponding, word in the Hebrew, is sometimes "set forth as the final place of punishment." Thus Job 24 : 19, "Drought and heat consume the snow waters: so doth the grave"—*sheol*—"those which have sinned." Hence here *sheol* is represented as "the final place of punishment." Again, Psa. 9 : 17, "The wicked shall be turned in *sheol*." Here is an example contradicting Elder T.'s assertion. His school, to prove the wicked dead will live again, contend the word "*turned*," in this text, should be translated "*re*-turned." We do not admit it; but if we did, it would only show how inaccurate the Elder is, in his statement; for it would then read, "the wicked shall be returned into *sheol*"—Greek, *hades*—as "the final place of punishment:" so *hades*, when spoken of as the state of the wicked, is not, in reality, materially different from *gehenna*.

Saith the Eld., "God can and will destroy both soul and body in gehenna-fire, which is no doubt John's lake of fire."

But that "lake of fire" John saw, did not burn up the *devil*, Elder; see Rev. 20 : 10. Do not be in too much haste in your "*no doubts*." The lake of fire in Rev. is never called "*gehenna-fire*"—it is only your *inference!* "That's all."

Eld. T. waxes warm, and he says, his texts are so plain "my opponents are 'reduced to the extremities of solution' to dispose of them.—Accordingly, the plow-share of ruin is got out, and Mr. False-Criticism hitches on his hobby-horse, and drives it through the Book. The passages only mean—a few millions of sinners, who live to see our Lord come; or, it may mean—some dead corpses will be flung into gehenna! That's all."

And did not Jesus say the same thing? Is He "Mr. False-Criticism" who said, "Fear him who, AFTER he hath *killed*, hath power to cast into *gehenna*"? Are here not "dead corpses" to "be flung into *gehenna*"? Surely they are not alive when "flung" in. We are right glad to be found in so good company as our blessed Lord. It is frightful to the Elder to think dead corpses should be flung into genhnna! but he is placid as a summer's morn at the idea of making *alive* all dead sinners—most of whom never heard of gehenna, nor of Christ, nor of life

hereafter—and constituting them a living mass of flesh and bones to roast them in gehenna-fire till the life given unasked and unsought is scorched out of them! That is charming in his view! It is a shocking piece of mercy for God to announce to him, that instead of seeing sinners made *alive* from the dead to writhe in gehenna-fire, he must "go forth and look upon the *carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me." See Isa. 66 : 24.

The thing the Eld. has kept in the foreground throughout his articles, is an attempt to cast ridicule on the idea that the wicked might be brought out of their graves, and yet not be made alive. Now, though *we* have never affirmed such a thing, and he has been most unjust in the prominence he has given that idea, yet there is more Scripture harmonizing with it than for the reliving of the wicked dead. See the text Isa. 66 : 23, 24; also Jer. 8 : 1, 2; and the fact that "AFTER He hath killed" they may be cast into "gehenna-fire;" a phrase, by the way, which imports no more than a destruction from which there is no recovery, no revival into life. But the Eld. says—

"The idea" that "dead corpses" are to be "consigned to gehenna"** "is a view unworthy of any public teacher and too *absurdly silly* to waste words about."

The Eld. will please settle that controversy with Jesus, the great "teacher," who tells us to fear Him, who, *after* He hath *killed*, hath power to cast into gehenna.

The Eld.'s "recipe for success" in "the next new schism and sect," which he offers "gratuitously" to the "leaders" of it, we think he had better keep for *home* use: it is in harmony with his present attempt, and the attempts of some of his associates heretofore, to ridicule those whom they oppose. Your "recipe," Eld. will take best among yourselves, and it is so *life-like* of "somebody else," who works with you, that we do not wonder you made it so full and clear.

The Elder's opinion of "Retribution" is a "*notion*," of course, and we shall let it pass as a very harmless notion. That "Retribution proved a fire-brand" may be true; but who it burned most, is a matter of opinion: *time will tell.* No wonder the Eld. anticipated somebody would say,

"Br. T. you have dipped your pen in gall" *** "you write snappishly, and in bad humor." "You don't talk like yourself."

This shows his conscience is not quite "seared as with a hot iron;" he supposes some "Bro." may say these things of him. No doubt many will: many have already; even not a few who had before the highest respect for him. We sincerely regret that he has given occasion for any one thus to think or speak of him.

The Eld. is informed, he may rest from his fear of having to pass the purgatorial fires "for *nine months*," as we judge *one* month is amply sufficient to dispose of his labored effort, which would not have called for a notice, at all, but for the previous reputation of its author for candor and good sense. How depraving is error!

In conclusion, we ask our readers, once more, to read and circulate the work "LIFE FROM THE DEAD: or, *The Righteous only will live again.*" We wish to present no other reputation of Eld. T. and his brother "Retribution:" neither of whom have moved or shaken a *pillar* in that work: it stands just as strong as the first day these "CORRECTORS of heretics" made their assault on the glorious truth it advocates and defends, *viz.*: "LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST;" which is still our *motto.* Come to Him, perishing sinner, or you "shall not see life, but the wrath of God" will *abide* on you. O, haste to Christ for life.

NOTE BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.—It will be well for all interested in the question at issue, to observe, our opponents do not meet *our arguments.* They do not *notice*, much less *answer* them. Eld. Taylor boastingly cries out, "'Retribution' has never been answered!" But does he not know there was a book written long before "Retribution?" If there is a particle of "common sense" in his saying Retribution has not been answered, how much more have we to exclaim, as we *do*, "LIFE FROM THE DEAD" has not been answered! The author of Retribution *ostensibly* noticed it, but the great principles and arguments of that book were not *breathed at.* And Eld. T. came out with a vaunting introduction, telling us, he would "overhaul the matter," yet he is just as careful as his predecessor in "the polemical arena," not to take up our positions. He finds fault with our *explanations* in relation to a few texts which apparently oppose our view—but *our positive arguments he leaves untouched.* He will never know what "Gibraltar" *means* [theologically speaking] until he has mastered "LIFE FROM THE DEAD."

EXTRAS.—We have printed a hundred copies *extra* of this number of the EXAMINER. If any one wishes a few, they can have them for **$1** *per dozen*, but must apply soon.

CHRONOLOGY AND PROPHETIC EVENTS.

BY THE EDITOR.

In our last, we asked, "How are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulties in which we are involved by conflicting opinions and dates?" We answered as follows:

We are of opinion there is a way of escape out of all this confusion, which the *learned* and *unlearned* have thrown around us. We conceive it has arisen from three causes:

First—Making Darius, the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person.

Second—From confounding Cyrus the Great (or *Khosrau*) with the Scripture Cyrus, (or *Coresh*).

Third—From making the 70 weeks and the 7 weeks and 62 weeks to have a common beginning, as though the 7 and 62 were only a subdivision of the 70. All three of these positions, we think, are erroneous.

We then noticed another point from which confusion arose, viz.: The "not observing that there are *two* periods in Babylon and Media, one the 70 years *captivity*; the other the 70 years *desolations of Jerusalem*." On these points we refer the readers of the Examiner to what we there said. With regard to making Darius the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person, we judge the absurdity and impossibility of that being the case has been sufficiently made manifest.

The point to which attention is first called, now, is, that Cyrus the Great [or *Khosrau*) and the Cyrus of the Scriptures (or *Coresh*) are not the same individual, but two distinct and very different persons.

In the first place, Cyrus the Great did take Babylon at some period of its history, by turning the waters of the river Euphrates; all are agreed in this fact. In the next place, we have no account that Babylon was ever taken but once in that manner. Now, there is not the least particle of evidence in the Scriptures that any Cyrus had anything to do in taking Babylon in the time of Darius, the Median, or the reign of Belshazzar. The Scripture account, to say the least, renders it extremely improbable and absurd to suppose that any Cyrus, and especially one who should be a near relative to Darius, the Median, and his first General, as well as the man who actually took Babylon for that Darius, should not be mentioned in the government of Babylon, which immediately followed under Darius, (see Dan. 6 : 1,) but that Daniel, a Jew and a foreigner, should, by this

same Darius, be made Prime Minister, instead of this imaginary Cyrus the Great. Besides, it would follow, that if Cyrus had any office in the government, it was a place inferior to Daniel; for Darius was personally administering the government, as Daniel 6th clearly shows. If Cyrus, then, was an inferior to Daniel in the government, he was thrown into the lion's den with all the other presidents and governors who ruled over the land, or he was spared; if either of these events happened to him, it would be strange indeed if the Scriptures should pass over in silence the transaction at the time of its occurrence. We might multiply the improbabilities of supposing that Cyrus the Great, or any other Cyrus, had anything to do in the conquest of Babylon, in the time of Belshazzar, but these are, to our mind, unanswerable; and it is evident those profane historians, most relied upon in settling the chronology of Cyrus the Great, have made up their account more from *conjecture* than from facts.

That Cyrus the Great did take Babylon by turning the water of the river from its channel is a truth; but *when* did he do it? Not in the days of "Darius the Median." The city, it will not be pretended, was ever taken in this manner but once. It must not be forgotten that kings and princes had, in those days, many names, often; and it would not be possible, always, to determine, by the mere name, what person performed certain actions. That person may be called by one name at one time and another name at another. So Cyrus the Great might have had other names besides that of Cyrus; not unfrequently they changed their own names, or the name of their wise men or princes, to correspond with the names or character of some of their gods; see the case of Daniel and his companions, whose names were changed, or new ones added by their king. Daniel's name was "Belteshazzar, according to the name of my god," says Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. 4 : 8. Nebuchadnezzar is a name evidently attached to that king, not as his real name, but as a name he has assumed from some of his gods.

We see, then, if a transaction, and that not occurring but once, is attributed to two or more different names, those names must belong to the same individual, and identifies him as the actor in the case. Now, if the turning of the water of the river and taking Babylon by that means, is, by some historians, who are respectable authority, attributed to Nebuchadnezzar, for example, then, if they are not mistaken in that fact, the conclusion would be, Cyrus the Great and Nebuchadnezzar must be one, and identical; because, these things were never done but once, and yet Cyrus the Great and Nebuchadnezzar acted in this identical affair. Let us now examine this matter a little, for we have room only for a few words here.

Berossus says, Nebuchadnezzar "so far completed Babylon, that none who might besiege it *afterwards* should have it in their power to *divert the river* so as to facilitate an entrance into it." Thus it appears Babylon was taken in the manner attributed to Cyrus, before Nebuchadnezzar reigned, or Berossus was guilty of a great error. If he was correct in his statements, the city had been thus taken prior to Nebuchadnezzar; and if so, the fact is, that Cyrus the Great took Babylon prior to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and not in the days of Belshazzar. Nebuchadnezzar, then, reigned after Cyrus the Great, or their persons are identical; it is most likely to be the latter; and then Cyrus the Great, who is the same as Nebuchadnezzar, carried away captive the Jews, and was not their liberator, according to the common notion and chronology, which has made a world of confusion in the interpretation of prophecy.

Diodorus Siculus (Berossus in Cory. p. 39,) informs us that he who built the hanging gardens at Babylon, was Cyrus. L. Vives, in his notes on Augustine's City of God, says: "Bede saith that Cambyses, son of the elder Cyrus, was called by the Jews Nebuchodonosor."

Sir Wm. Jones says: "The Great Cyrus, whom I call, without fear of contradiction, Cai-Khosrau; for that I shall only doubt Khosrau of Ferdouri was the Cyrus of the first Greek historians, and the hero of the oldest political and moral romance, when I doubt that Louis *Quatorze* and Louis Fourteenth were one and the same French King." He then goes on to give his reasons, which are conclusive. Again he says in his work, vol. 3, p. 106: "Whatever our chronologers say, it is not easy to conceive that the Jews were delivered by *this* Cyrus. The name Coresh, used by Isaiah, has no affinity with the Persian word Khosrau, and we cannot suppose any corruption of the sacred text; whereas all the Persian writers agree that a prince named Coresh, who was sent by Bahaman, son of Asfundier, to govern Babylon in the room of Baltazar, actually protected the captive Jews, and permitted them to rebuild their temple." Sir Wm. Jones adds: "Our historians, deceived perhaps by the name Cyrus, which the Greeks gave both to Khosrau and to Coresh, have fixed the return of the Jews much earlier than the truth."

The proclamation of Coresh, or Cyrus, in Ezra 1 : 1-2, may be considered an objection to the idea that Coresh could be any other than a supreme and independent king. But several things may be noted on that point. First. The language of Coresh, in regard to the extent of his dominions, is his own, and not inspiration. Second. It was not an uncommon thing for an eastern prince, who was appointed by another, to be more powerful than his sovereign. Third. The phrase "all the kingdoms of the

world," in eastern language, may signify no more than "all the *land*," or territory concerned in the Jews' return, that being the subject matter of discourse; and that "land" was the land where they were in captivity and the land of Canaan; which "the God of heaven" had placed in the hands of Coresh. Allowance is also to be made for the style of the ancients. See an example in 1 Kings 18 : 10, "As the Lord thy God liveth, there is no nation nor kingdom, whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee: and when they said, He is not there, he took an oath of the kingdom and nation, that they found thee not."

We are not to infer from this language of Obadiah that Ahab had actually and literally sent into all nations and kingdoms; but the expression denotes that the inquiry had been of a most extensive character. Bishop Patrick says, "It would be a foolish conceit, from this expression, to attribute anything like universal dominion to Ahab, hence all commentators limit the expression either to the neighboring nations in league with him, or to the ten tribes, or to the nations where he could in reason think that Elijah had hid himself." "Nothing," says Poole, "is more frequent than to understand general expressions with such limitations."

Cyrus the Great could never use the same language that Coresh did without some limitation; for, he certainly never did, literally, possess "all the kingdoms of the world."

The conclusion we arrive at is this: Cyrus the Great and the Cyrus of the Scriptures, are two distinct persons—one living at the commencement of the captivity, the other at its termination. By not understanding this fact, chronologists and commentators have fallen into great confusion, and opened the door to bring discredit on revelation itself, by adopting some of the most absurd propositions, in regard to periods and time, that can well be imagined.

We wish to group together a few points that show, to our mind, irresistibly, that the common chronology of the times of Daniel and Ezra must be erroneous.

The Decree of Cyrus, by that chronology, is placed B.C. 536.

The second year of Darius, under whose decree the temple was finished, is placed B.C. 520.

See Haggai 1 : 1-15, and compare it with Ezra 5 and 6 : 8-12, 15. The temple, then, was finished in the sixth year of Darius, or B.C. 516.

The common chronology makes the first decree of Artaxerxes, under which Ezra went up to Jerusalem B.C. 457.

That is 59 years after the temple was finished!

Strange, truly, that the commandment to restore (thy people)

and to build Jerusalem, should be so long after the temple was finished!

The common chronology places Dan. 9th chap., B.C. 538. The 70 years "desolations of Jerusalem" were then ending; compare verse 2 of that chapter with Zech. 1 : 7, 12, 16. That is, according to the common chronology, *eighty-one* years before the commandment of Artaxerxes: and Daniel must have been dead at least *seventy-five* years before Ezra went up. Thus, that commandment would have been no guide to Daniel; and Gabriel trifled with him in telling *him* to "*know and understand*" a point not yet passed, and to which he gave him no clue by which he could be guided.

RE-LIVING OF THE WICKED DEAD: A SUGGESTION.

BY S. D. BEEGLE.

I HAVE read most of what has been written against the resurrection of the wicked, and though many of the arguments are forcible, yet there is a pointedness and power in many of the scriptural arguments upon the other side, which it is not easy for me to resist. My object in this article, is not to enter into a general discussion of the matter, but to suggest a mode of harmonizing some of the conflicting considerations which bear upon it.

Two of the principal arguments against the reliving of the wicked dead, are as follows: *First*, the fact that in a number of places in Scripture, the resurrection is spoken of as if it was *peculiar* to the righteous. *Second*, it is said such a resurrection, *if it takes place*, must appear simply vindictive, and therefore the idea is unreasonable.

As to the first difficulty, we would suggest whether the fact, (supposing it for the present to be a fact,) of the resurrection of the unjust, may not be harmonized with the passages above referred to, by an application of the same principle of interpretation, which is warranted by our Lord in his use of the words *Death, Die*, &c. While we know that the righteous die, as well as the wicked, Christ evidently speaks upon some occasions *as if death was peculiar to the wicked*. Thus John 6 : 50, "that a man may eat thereof and *not* die." John 8 : 51, "if a man keep my saying he shall *never see death*." John 11 : 26, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *never die*." Compare also John 10 : 28; 3 : 15, 16; and numerous other passages which affirm

that "they shall live," and that "they *have* eternal life." Now the key to be used here, is given us by Christ himself, in what he says respecting the maid, in Math. 9 : 24, and parallel passages; and respecting Lazarus in John 11 : 11, 14. "The maid is *not dead*." But why so? If she was *merely* asleep was it any miracle to awake her? "Our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*," says Christ. His disciples thought this would be a *benefit* to Lazarus; but "then said Jesus unto them *plainly, Lazarus is dead*." Now the principle is this: in the case of those whose death is but temporary—to be followed by a revival into life—*it is not considered worthy to be called death*: so, also, the present *life*, of the wicked, seems to be considered by Christ as unworthy to be called life; and hence they are said to "have *no life*," John 5 : 40; 6 : 53; as "not to see life," John 3 : 36; and as *dead*, Math. 8 : 22. Compare Paul in Eph. 2 : 1, and Col. 2 : 13, &c., &c. And upon the same principle, it may be, that the resurrection of the unjust, as it is soon to be followed by utter destruction, is not considered *worthy to be called a resurrection*. I hope this thought will be carefully and prayerfully weighed by those who oppose the idea of the resurrection of the wicked. For one I confess myself unsettled respecting this question.—May God guide us into *all* truth; and above all, may we not depart from the written word, nor from a sound interpretation of it.

The second idea, above named, is no difficulty to my own mind; but as it seems to be so to others, I wish to offer a suggestion. It is said, "It is hard to believe that they (the wicked) are raised up *by a miracle* that ends in their destruction, or that accomplishes nothing but a judgment, which in this view must appear simply vindictive," (Hudson's "Debt and Grace," p. 263). Hence, Bro. Hudson attempts to account for such resurrection by dismissing the idea of its being miraculous, and *connecting it with the redemption, by a law*, that finds illustration, (as he thinks) in the fact that damaged seeds often exhaust their vitality, and perish, in germination, and other like facts.

We might here ask Bro. Hudson, if he is not, in this instance, like the Rationalists: "preferring a law of nature to the assurances of its author." Debt and Grace, p. 2. But, not to insist upon this, and taking it for granted, for the present, that there *is* such a law, connecting this resurrection with the redemption; we may ask, who established that law?—and, supposing it to have been a *necessary* law; who *declines* to suspend, miraculously, *the operation* of that law upon the wicked dead? Would not either of these, viz., establishing the law, if unnecessary; and if necessary, declining to suspend its power over the *wicked* dead, appear *as* vindictive as raising them up by a miracle?

But we think their resurrection by miracle, *need not necessarily* be looked upon as vindictive. Human rulers are not vindictive because they inflict upon criminals the penalties which wisdom has decided it necessary to threaten. Even Washington was not vindictive when he refused to accede to the earnest plea of Major Andre, that he might be permitted to die a *soldier's* death, by being shot, instead of the death of a spy, by being hanged. Undoubtedly the generous impulses of Washington's nature would have prompted him to have granted this request, but for one thing, viz., he considered the exigencies of his government demanded that the most impressive example should be made of Andre, that could be made consistently with reason and international law. So God, for the advantage of his moral government, *may have seen it* NECESSARY to *threaten* just this doom to the wicked; and if *it was* necessary to *threaten* it, then there will be no vindictiveness in inflicting it. The need of such threatenings will hardly be questioned by the thoughtful student of the human heart and of human society. The moral bearings of the doctrine of *no* retribution beyond the grave, are worthy of *very careful* consideration. To say the least of it, such a doctrine must very greatly loosen the restraints of vice. Brethren, let us ponder it well, and pray over it a great deal.

NOTE TO THE ABOVE.—The writer of the foregoing will get rid of his "doubt" on the "reliving of the wicked dead," if he will carefully consider the conclusion to which his own reasoning inevitably leads. His article distinctly recognizes the fact that *Death*, in the Bible, has a *mitigated* and an *absolute* sense. The former of these is that sense which regards Death as a state "to be followed by a *revival* into *life*"; the *absolute* sense, then, must regard Death as a condition which will *never* "be followed by a *revival* into *life*." Amen. Now, apply the principle, and you establish the doctrine of Life only in Christ.—Our friend is right in asserting that "Death" is presented in our Lord's teachings as "*peculiar* to the *wicked*." But *what* Death? The "principle of interpretation" brought forward by Bro. Beegle furnishes the answer, viz., a death which is *not* "to be followed by a *revival into life*." If the "principle" is a good one, this answer is the only one that is admissible. And what follows? We reply,—it follows that when Jesus said, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and ARE *dead*" (John 6 : 49), he meant to teach that there would be for the fathers *no* "revival into life;" it follows that when He said,

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not* DIE" (vr. 50), he clearly inculcates the doctrine that the rejecters of Christ will *not* have their Death broken, or interrupted, by "a revival into life;" it follows that the declaration, "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see *death*" (John 8 : 51), must have such an interpretation as will exclude the disobedient from any "revival into life;" it follows that when our Lord declared, "Ye shall seek me, and shall DIE *in your sins*" (John 8 : 21), His threatening pointed to an *absolute* Death, from which there would be *no* "revival into life;" it follows that the Saviour in His assurance to Martha, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *never* DIE" (John 11 : 26), virtually affirmed, that, as being himself "the Resurrection and the Life," He would "never" grant "a revival into life" to unbelievers. Turn now to 1 Cor. 15 : 17, and see how the statement, "ye are yet *in your sins*," is made to explain why—"if Christ be not raised"—those fallen asleep "ARE *perished*" in a sense manifestly precluding *any future life;* thus showing that *sin*, unpardoned, stands as an eternal barrier to "a revival into life." Then ponder the declaration in the fifty-sixth verse, "The *sting* of *death* is *sin*," and see how clearly the Apostle evinces the truth that "sin" gives to Death such a fatal, damning power as must forever shut out the impenitent dead from any "revival into life." The sentiment, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we DIE," is sound wisdom *if* the *righteous* dead are never to live again, and in precisely *this* aspect—no other—does the Apostle present it; the fact, however, that the righteous *are* to be raised up at the last day is—as the matter actually stands—*the* reason why Epicurean indulgence shall be shunned, and holy living cultivated, by the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. The *wicked*, because they live after the flesh, "*shall* DIE" (see Rom. 8 : 13); for them, therefore, there remains *no* "revival into life;" *they* will be eternally left *unquickened*. Infinite love says, "*turn* and *live*." Let us heed the expostulation with our whole hearts. R. W.

DONATINS TO THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—W. S. Olmstead (for two monthly pledges), $2. Mary Barnes, $1. "Once-a-month," $1. "C." $1. Philadelphia, (no name), $1.

BOSTON, Mass.—In that city the friends of truth and love have taken a new Hall, in "KAST BUILDINGS," 104 Hanover-St. It is a large, pleasant, and airy place, and very quiet: far better in this and every respect than Chapman Hall, where they formerly met. The first and second Sabbaths in May the EDITOR of this Magazine spent with this church in its new location.—The fractious elements seem to have gone "out from us, because they were not of us;" and so peace and harmony are, at present, triumphant. May our gracious Lord grant it may continue so. Deep interest was manifested the two Sabbaths the Editor was there; and the prospect was most encouraging. They have invited JOSEPH T. CURRY to follow in the ministry of the word of life, for four Sabbaths, at least. May heavenly wisdom be granted him, and much good result from his labors in Boston: we think it cannot be otherwise: let all pray that it may be so.—The truth of "*Life only in Christ*" has a strong hold there, and is not likely to be shaken by any assaults of Eld. D. T. Taylor, or others of like spirit. We can afford to be calm and patient: the cause is the cause of God, and He can and will defend it from all the attacks whether from good or bad men. At no period of the history of this truth, since its revival from the rubbish of Romanism, has it stood in a more prosperous position than now. The "*fire* and sword" our opponents have used against us, have only served to brighten our armor and call attention to the subject, which only needs to be understood to commend itself to every mind willing to know the truth. It fills the hearts of saints, who receive it, with joy: "*it is so like the God of love*," who has "no pleasure in the death of the wicked." Let us go calmly forward, and God will prosper us.

The first sermon in the new Hall in Boston, was on the Lord's Supper, as an *anniversary* feast to "show the Lord's death till He come." The Sabbath being the full moon at which the Caraite Jews keep the passover, and most likely to be the true time for the feast, in our judgment, we kept it in the evening, and had a most interesting time. Some sixty partook of the feast; all seemed refreshed and strengthened, and we were reluctant to part. Thank the Lord for that precious season. We trust, all in the faith of Jesus as the LIFE-GIVER will yet see and practice the *annual* communion as the true and only season to "show the Lord's death." We shall give an article on the subject soon.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

THIS *Magazine* is devoted mainly to Bible questions; specially to the great themes of JESUS CHRIST's personal return to, and reign on earth—Life, future and eternal, only through Him—and literal death, never to be revoked, as the wages of sin.

It is intended to be issued *Monthly*, 32 pages octavo. TERMS, *One Dollar* for 12 numbers; paid in *advance*.

REMITTANCES.—Persons making communications to us, will please consider it a *receipt* for money they send, if they receive what they write for, instead of our acknowledging their letters in the EXAMINER. Generally, in case of remittance, they receive what they order before the acknowledgment could appear in our Magazine. To *print* all the names of Correspondents is attended with inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

LETTERS should be well sealed, but never "registered." Money for the EXAMINER is at the *Editor's* risk, when sent as herein directed, without adding to, or omitting any thing from the directions. If this course is not complied with, it is at the risk of the person remitting.

MONEY sent for any of the works in our *Catalogue* of Books, is at the risk of the *purchaser*, except when the *retail* price is remitted, then it shall be *mutual*. The risk is small, if our instructions are strictly followed; we will not be responsible in any degree unless this is done. Be careful, in all cases, not to send depreciated Bank bills. We have had to pay *twenty* per cent. on some funds sent us, or else return the money. This ought not to be.

THE POSTAGE on the *bound* Examiner, for 1860, is *twenty-six* cents, any distance less than 3000 miles.

☞ We invite our friends to examine the *Catalogue* of works, on the last page of this cover, and send for such as they can make profitable to themselves or others. By doing this, you will benefit the cause we advocate, and help the EDITOR of this Magazine.

Invariably address, GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New-York*.

———:o:———

STANDING RULES FOR WRITERS FOR THIS MAGAZINE.

1. Each writer is required to state his own views on the topic he takes up, without a direct personal controversy with any other writer in our columns. This course does not restrict liberty of expression on any topics others have presented, but is designed to save personal feelings.

2. Each individual correspondent is *alone* responsible for the sentiments of his article: the fact of the insertion is not to be construed as an approval by the EDITOR.

3. The main object of this Magazine, as expressed on its cover, must be kept in view by all writers: other topics may, however, sometimes be admitted, if space will allow.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS:

FOR SALE AT THE BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

On all books and pamphlets, sent by mail, the postage has to be *pre-paid.* The following works will be sent, any distance under 3000 miles, postage free, on receipt of the retail price; except the *bound* EXAMINERS.

SIX SERMONS on the inquiry, *Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering?* To which is added a sermon on *Christ the Life-giver*, or the faith of the Gospel, by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner;* with an Introduction defending the Bible and its Author against Infidels. This work contains double the amount of matter of the original Six Sermons. *Price*, in plain binding, 50 cents; in paper covers, 30 cents.

THE WATCH TOWER: OR, MAN IN DEATH; *and the Hope for a Future Life.*—A Pamphlet of 96 pages. A thorough cure for the modern *necromancy*, misnamed "*spiritualism*," which is really *animalism*. *Price*, 20 cents.

LIFE FROM THE DEAD; or, *The Righteous only will live again.* By the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. The author believes this subject is one of vast importance. It illustrates the whole Gospel scheme, and shows the mercy of God in its true light, while man is seen to be wholly mortal. It cuts up the modern *man-worship*, which is hurrying so many on to rank atheism. *Price*, 20 cents.

LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.—This embraces the whole of the three previous named works, and the Tract on Atonement, bound in one volume of 360 pages, and lettered on the back. It contains a full view of the doctrine of "*No life out of Christ*," as held by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price*, $1.

MAN'S DESTINY.—*Immortality:* The Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D.D., St. Louis, Mo., *Reviewed* by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. A very valuable work. *Price*, in pamphlet, 30 cents.

BIBLE VS. TRADITION: in which the True Teaching of the Bible is manifested: showing the true meaning of the terms *Soul, Spirit, Hell, Everlasting, Eternity, Life, Death*, &c. AN invaluable help to understanding the Scriptures. *Price*, bound, 75 cents. A cheap edition, in paper covers, 40 cents.

OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN.—This work was written by Prof. WILSON, England, some years since. We republished it, believing it could not fail to interest all thinking men, whatever might be thought of the accuracy of its positions. For ourself, we indorse the general theory that the *Anglo-Saxons* are the literal descendants of Israel, in the line of Joseph and Ephraim. Price, 50 cents, in paper covers only.

BIBLE EXAMINER *bound*; Vol. 13, $1.75. Vol. 14, $1.85. This includes the postage: $1.50 each without the postage.

TRACTS AND SMALL WORKS.

MAN'S NATURE AND DESTINY; or, the Animal man and the Spiritual man. A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 5 cents.

LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN; or, Life only through Christ, not a heresy; by DR. J. K. FINLEY, Pittsburgh, Pa. *Price*, 5 cents.

THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM: by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price*, 7 cents.

THE ATONEMENT: by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 3 cents.

DOOM OF THE UNGODLY; or, *The Wicked Dead remain eternally under death's dominion.* A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 5 cents.

Other Tracts will be added, if funds are to be had.

Orders for any of these works may be left with GEO. W. YOUNG, 35 Ann-St., New York.

All *Letters* sent by mail, must be addressed,

GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New York.*

Vol. XV. PUBLISHED MONTHLY. 1863.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES."—JESUS.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR.

TERMS:

One Dollar per Vol. of 384 Pages. Single Numbers, of 32 Pages, 15 Cts.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR:

POST OFFICE ADDRESS, BOX 4658,

NEW-YORK.

Contents of the July Number.

1. THE ANTICHRIST. By Joseph T. Curry,.....193
2. THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. A Dialogue.....200
3. QUESTIONS ABOUT BAPTISM. By H. J. Sweetland.....204
4. "CAST FORTH AS AN ABORTION,".....207
5. DOES CHRIST RESTORE ALL THAT ADAM LOST?.....208
6. ELD. T. M. PREBLE AND THE WICKED DEAD,..... 209
7. H. W. BEECHER.—THE ATONEMENT,.....212
8. THE OUTGOING AND INCOMING ADMINISTRATION...215
9. ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE WITH GOD,.....217
10. THE HOLY SPIRIT,.....219
11. LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS,.....220
12. THE EDITOR,.....222
13. DISCUSSION IN BOSTON,.....223

REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS TO EXAMINER.

RUFUS WENDELL, *Salem*, Mass
JOSEPH T. CURRY, *Boston*, Mass.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"THIS IS THE RECORD, THAT GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, AND THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON. HE THAT HATH THE SON, HATH LIFE; AND HE THAT HATH NOT THE SON, HATH NOT LIFE."

Vol. 15. No. 7.] **JULY, 1863.** [Whole No. 226.

THE ANTICHRIST.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THE word *antichrist* occurs only in the Epistles of John. The prefix *anti* may signify either opposition, or substitution.—Hence, the Antichrist of John may either be an opposer of Christ, or a usurper of his office. The Apostle's language shows that the former is meant. And yet the latter would involve the former; for a usurper of Christ's office would be the most effectual opposer conceivable.

"Ye have heard that the Antichrist shall come," says John. He then goes on to state that there were, even then, "many antichrists;" men who opposed Christ: but he appears to have referred to *the* Antichrist which "shall come," when he said "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is the Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son."—1 John 2 ch. Again, in his second epistle, he says, "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." He then declares this to be characteristic of the coming one: "*This* is the deceiver and the antichrist." (In our three quotations we have employed the definite article, in accordance with the original.)

In connection with John's words comes the prediction of Christ, John 5: 43: "*I* am come in my father's name, and ye (Jews) receive me not: if *another* shall come in his own name, him *ye will receive.*" It is certain from this prophecy that the Jews will formally accept a false Messiah. The man who assumes this character will do, substantially, what is declared by John in his epistle: coming "in his own name"—that is, offer-

ing no credentials from "the Father"—he will, of necessity, be compelled to deny that "Jesus is the Christ;" "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh;" for it would be absurd for *a mortal* to claim the Messianic office, if the Messiah *has come* in the *flesh*, and is now to be looked for as a spiritual being, in all the glory of his immortal nature, to assume "the government" which is his "right."

The Antichrist will be an apostate Christian. The "many antichrists," saith John, "went out from *us*:" so will it be with "*the* antichrists." By "Christian" we mean an adherent of the *nominal* church.

The Antichrist will spring from the Roman Catholic pale.—In 2 Thess. 2 ch. Paul says, "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that ye be not soon shaken in mind. . . as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come *a falling away* first, and that man of sin be revealed." The "falling away" has been consummated in the Roman Catholic Church, the "mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." As the "man of sin" is mentioned in connection with the apostasy, it is quite certain that he will arise from that quarter. He will out-Herod Herod; attaching to himself all the infamy of his mother church, with the crowning addition of the denial of "the Father and the Son," by his wicked assumption of the Messiahship.

Paul continues: "And now ye know what withholdeth (or, holdeth) that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now withholdeth will withhold, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be *revealed*." That is, the falling away or apostasy which already worked in Paul's day was to continue until the time came for the revelation of the "man of sin."—Thus the Roman Catholic Church will usher in the "man of sin," "the son of perdition."

The Antichrist will be a Spiritualist. "Whose *coming*," saith Paul, "is according to the working of *Satan*, with *all power* and *signs* and *lying wonders*." 2 Thess. ii. 9. As Jesus attested his character by *miracles*, so his counterfeit will use the Satanic power of Spiritualism as a proof of his right to the throne of David. The Antichrist, in fact, is "the coming man" talked of by Spiritualists.

The Antichrist will be a prince of the Roman or Latin power. In the ninth chapter of Daniel is recorded the earnest prayer of the prophet with reference to the time of the restoration of his people Israel, and the return of the glory to the holy city of Jerusalem. "The man Gabriel" was sent to answer the prayer. He said, "Seventy weeks (of years, Lev. xxv. 8) are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the (punishment of) transgression, and to make an end of (the punishment of the national) sins, and to make reconciliation for (national) iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness (by the second advent of the Messiah) and to seal up (complete, fulfill,) the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy (Jesus as "King over all the earth," Zech. xiv. 9). Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth (see Ezra vii.) of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem shall be seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks." That is, in 483 years from the decree of Artaxerxes, recorded in Ezra 7, and which was made B. C. 457–8, "Messiah the Prince" was to be manifested. This was fulfilled A. D. 25–6, when John the Baptist manifested Jesus to Israel. See John 1: 31, 34, 41, 49.

Gabriel continues, "And after three-score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, (accomplished A. D. 28–9,) but not for himself: and *the people* of THE PRINCE THAT SHALL COME shall destroy the city and the sanctuary." The seventieth week does not follow the sixty-ninth. If it did, the prophecy should read "In the seventieth week shall Messiah be cut off." But no mention is made of the last week until *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred A. D. 70. The 27th verse reads, "And he shall confirm a ('*the*' not correct) covenant with many for one week." Here is the seventieth week, which *immediately precedes* the fulfillment of the 24th verse, at the Second Advent of Christ. Hence, we conclude that the seventieth week of Daniel comes in at the *close* of the gospel dispensation. "*He*" that "shall confirm a covenant" must be "THE PRINCE THAT SHALL COME" of the preceding verse. The "*people*" of this prince destroyed the city, i. e., the Romans. Hence "the prince that shall come" will be *a Roman prince*. In the 25th and 26th verses, the two princes are distinguished as "Messiah the Prince" and "the Prince that shall come;" the *true* Christ and the *false* one.

The Antichrist will make a seven years "covenant with many" (of the Jews)—probably to restore them to Palestine and protect them in their worship. Dan. 9 : 27. In return for this favor the Jews will fulfill Christ's prediction and "receive" "the prince that shall come" as their Messiah.

The Antichrist is spoken of, Daniel 11 : 21–45. Prideaux says: "Jerome and Porphyry exactly agree in their explication of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, till they come to the twenty-first verse. For what follows from thence to the end of the chapter was all explained by Porphyry to belong to Antiochus Epiphanes and to have been all transacted in the time of his reign. But here Jerome differs from him, and saith, that most of this, as well as some parts of the eighth and twelfth chapters of the same book, relate principally to Antichrist; that although some particulars in these prophecies had a typical completion in Antiochus Epiphanes, yet were all of them wholly and ultimately to be fulfilled only in Antichrist; and this, he saith, was the general sense of the fathers of the Christian church in his time. And he explains it by a parallel taken from the 72d Psalm, which in some parts of it was typically true of Solomon . . . but was wholly and ultimately only so of Christ. And therefore, he would have these prophecies which are in Daniel 8 : 9–12, 23–26; 11 : 21–45; 12 : 6–13, to be fulfilled in the same manner, that is, in part and typically in Antiochus, but wholly and ultimately only in Antichrist."—*Prideaux*, vol. II. 140. Prideaux further says: "Antiochus Epiphanes having been a great oppressor of the church of God, under the Jewish economy, and the type of antichrist which was to oppose it in after ages under the Christian, more is prophetically said of him in Daniel than of any other prince which these prophecies relate to." Vol. II. 137.

Is Louis Napoleon "the man of sin"? Time will show. At present, we are thoroughly possessed of the belief that he is the man. We have said that the Antichrist will be an apostate from the Roman Catholic church, and a Spiritualist. Napoleon answers to this mark. To be sure, the Pope calls him "the eldest son of the Church," but he has also denounced him with bitterness. At any rate, the fact that Napoleon is a Spiritualist is conclusive. He professes to be guided by the spirit of his uncle, and we know that Hume, the celebrated American medium, is a great favorite at the Tuileries.

Napoleon is also a prince of the Latin race. True to this mark, he has plainly expressed his design of uniting the Latin race on both sides of the Atlantic. In relation to his expedition to Mexico, he has lately said: "If Mexico preserves its independence, and maintains the integrity of its territory, if a stable government is constituted with the assistance of France, we shall have *restored to the Latin race* on the other side of the ocean *its strength and prestige.*"

There is great reason to believe that Napoleon will yet fulfill the prediction in Dan. 9 : 27, and make a treaty with the Jews to protect them in their re-establishment in their own land. An incident which has come to light is very significant. "The Israelite Indeed" for February, copies from the "Bristol Times" a report of a lecture delivered at the Strand Church Miss. Auxiliary Meeting, by the Rev. C. E. Oakley, rector of Wickwar. We extract the following remarks:

"A Jew said to the speaker in Algiers in 1859, 'I have lived here from a boy, and known many revolutions in the native governments. I have watched the French governments under the various conditions of a Constitutional Monarchy, a Republic, and an Empire. I have seen only one stable thing in Africa all this time, and that has been the character of my people.—There has been only one fixed ruling idea, perpetually waxing in greatness and increasing in power, *the idea pervading our race that we are soon to become a great nation again, and so return to our land.*' He (Mr. Oakley) asked him if he carried that out in acts, by assisting with his wealth to carry his countrymen back. He replied that many Jews along the seaboard were forming themselves into a community for that very purpose. They were sending their poor brethren to Jerusalem, and laying out their money there before going themselves. He would add a single fact which he told me on the authority of a dignitary of the church from whom he heard it. One of the great Jewish financiers of Europe recently had an interview with the French Emperor. After talking some time of great monetary speculations, the financier was about to depart, when the Emperor stopped him and said abruptly, '*Well, Jew, and when is your nation going back to Palestine?*' '*When your Majesty is prepared to lead them there.*' The Emperor asked, '*Is your race prepared to receive me as their Messiah?*' To that the Jew gave no answer, but it was a conversation pregnant with much thought."

The history of Louis Napoleon has already agreed with some

parts of Dan. 11 : 21–45. The 21st verse is a most graphic description of his condition before the Revolution of 1848—"a vile person"—and of his subtle and triumphant accomplishment of his designs with reference to the imperial power. Vs. 22–24, are readily interpreted in harmony with his subsequent career. Vs. 25, 26, might be applied to the Italian war which ended so suddenly by the peace of Villa Franca; and the 27th is a good description of the manner in which that peace was made. In the years 1855, '56, and '57, Napoleon coined more gold than both England and the United States together; which partially fulfills the first part of v. 43, and his proclivity for negro troops—a fresh instance of which is displayed in the late transmission of black soldiers to Mexico—equally answers to the last part. The 45th verse is alluded to by Dr. Barclay, in his "City of the Great King."

"The Sultan has not only made an oblation of the churches of St. Anne, the Holy Sepulchre, and various other 'Holy Shrines' to the Emperor of the French, but has also given him decidedly the largest and finest square in the Holy City—the site of the Palace of the Knights of St. John—that he may 'plant the tabernacle of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain!' The right of appointing to the high office of 'Guardian of the Hill of Zion, and Custodian of the Holy Land,' is thus conferred upon Louis Napoleon, the acknowledged patron of the Latin Church."

The prediction in Dan. 8 : 23–25, has its accomplishment in one respect—Napoleon is "a king of fierce (hard, stony,) countenance." "This man-mystery," says one, "the depths of whose duplicity no Oedipus has yet sounded, is a problem even to those who surround him. I watched his pale, corpse-like, imperturbable features, not many months since, for a period of three hours. I saw eighty thousand men in arms pass before him, and I never observed a change in his countenance or an expression in his look which would enable the bystander to say whether he was pleased or otherwise. . . He did not speak to those around him, except at very long intervals, and then with an air of nonchalance, of ennui, and eternal occupation with self." All who are acquainted with the man agree in testifying to the frigid and inaccessible nature of Napoleon. Dan. 8 : 25 well answers to his character—"And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand." He is emphatically a man of craft and policy—beyond all question, the first diplomatist in the world.

The apocalypse affords collateral evidence of great weight as to Napoleon being the man of destiny and prophecy. In Rev. 17 we have the "woman"—the Papacy—sitting on a "beast"—the Roman Empire. The "seven Kings" are the seven forms of government—Kings, Consuls, Decemvirs, Dictators, Tribunes, The Roman Emperorship, The French Emperorship. "*Five*" had "*fallen*" in John's time, and the Roman Emperorship was the "*one is*," which continued in various forms until 1806, when Francis II abdicated the imperial crown of Germany at the dictation of Napoleon I. The French Emperorship was virtually another form of government. Napoleon's infant son was "provisionally entitled 'King of Rome,' in notification of his future destiny to succeed his father on the throne of the Roman Empire."—*Menzel's His. Ger.* The seventh head continued "a short space"—till 1815—when it was seemingly "wounded to death." Rev. 13 : 3. But the "deadly wound was healed" when Napoleon III seized the imperial power 1852. This revivification of the French Emperorship was predicted, on the strength of the Apocalyptic utterances, by several writers *twenty years* before Louis Napoleon became Emperor of the French.

In conclusion we call attention to the remarkable fact that Napoleon's name answers to the number "six hundred threescore and six." Rev. 13 : 18. His first name, Louis is *Ludovicus* in Latin. Reduced to Roman notation we have L 50, U 5, D 500, O 0. V 5, I 1, C 100, U 5, S 0=666. So also with Napoleon when rendered in the dative case—as it would be on a statue in Greek. N 50, a 1, p 80, o 70, l 30, e 5, o 70, n 50, t 300, i 10=666. It is singular that the word "*Apollyon*," Rev. 9 : 11, so nearly parallels *Napoleon*. We are inclined to think that the Antichrist is referred to in Jeremiah's prophecy, ch. 4 : 7. "The lion is come up from his thicket, and the destroyer of the nations is on his way; he is gone forth from his place to make thy land desolate." The word *Napoleon* is etymologically set forth in this text. The Greek word may be analyzed thus: *Napos, thicket; leon, lion.* Napoleon—Lion of the thicket.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

A DIALOGUE.

ELD. R. V. LYON.—It is as clear as a sunbeam in mid-heaven, that a *visionary* conversion, that none can describe or know anything about, and a fancied faith, that the disciples of Jesus at the present time or day, are baptised with the Holy Spirit—then following a fancied spirit, that has sealed sentiments upon their hearts, which are in direct opposition to the *Living Oracles*, has been the means of bringing the cause of truth into disrepute ; thereby *prevented* the thinking and candid mind from embracing it!—*Mill. Har.*, May 13.

EXAMINER.—We are perfectly agreed as to the character of "a *visionary* conversion" and "a *fancied* faith" ; also, of "a *fancied* spirit," &c., but the implied idea, that because some are visionary and fanciful, therefore no one has any thing *real* in these matters, we do not agree with, at all : and such a sentiment is the very thing that has filled the churches with a dead formality, so that multitudes have "a name" to live "and are dead."

LYON.—It is true that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was promised on the primitive disciples, that they might be endowed with power to confirm the covenant or unfold the Christian system to the Jews first, then to the Gentiles. And we shall find, upon an investigation of the Oracles of Divine Truth, that in every instance in which they were baptised with the Holy Spirit, it endowed them with power to speak with tongues !

EXR.—You give us Acts 2 : 1–11, and similar texts, in proof of your position ; but we beg you to remember, in none of these instances is it called being "baptised with the Holy Spirit."—The Spirit was said to be *poured* on them, it *fell* on them, was *shed* on them, they were *filled* with it, &c. We shall show you that the communication of the Spirit was to *all believers* ; and it is for you to show all of them were "endowed with power to speak with tongues?" But we will hear what you say on the fulfillment of a prophecy.

LYON.—It ought always to be remembered that when Jehovah fulfills a prophecy in the dispensation to which it belongs, it is final ; hence, we are not to look, nor expect a second fulfillment of Joel's prophecy in this age—"I will pour out of my Spirit,"—for Peter testifies that it had its fulfillment on the day of Pentecost ; and its effects were seen, as we have shown you.

EXR.—Here you distinctly rdmit the baptism of the Spirit

belongs to *this* dispensation. That is true. You say, "Its fulfillment on the day of Pentecost was such "we are not to look, nor expect a second fulfillment of Joel's prophecy in this age:" *i. e.*, in this dispensation. This assumption proves far too much. You dare not deny that the same baptism did occur in several instances after the day of Pentecost, even contrary to Peter's expectation, and, in one case, to his utter amazement. How then is it true that this *one* fulfillment on that day was its "final" one, so that we are not to "expect a second fulfillment in this age"?

The truth is, Peter's language—which you do not quote—condemns your construction of the prophecy and its fulfillment; for that prophecy, as Peter quotes it, expressly includes the whole dispensation, including the signs and wonders in the sun, moon, &c., which are immediately to precede "the great and notable day of the Lord" ; and he declares this pouring out of the Spirit is to be on "all flesh," and that "in the last days" ; not on the day of Pentecost only, nor for the ability to speak with tongues merely ; for saith Peter to the multitude, "Repent and be baptized *every one* of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and *ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost :* for the *promise*" (of God by Joel, as well as by Jesus Christ) "is unto you and unto your *children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

This does not look like restricting the baptism of the Holy Spirit to the day of Pentecost, nor to the Apostolic ministry, but extends it to the latest period of the dispensation which was then opening.

Because some spake with tongues who received this baptism, does it follow that all did or would? We know they did not ; for Paul saith, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversity of tongues :" and he asks, "do all speak with tongues?" and tells them to "covet earnestly the best gifts." He also assures them "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to *every man* to profit withal," and that, while there are "diversities of gifts," it is "the same Spirit," and that this Spirit divides "to every man severally as he will." See 1 Corth. 12.

The difficulty with you is, you assume the baptism of the

Holy Spirit, or the gift of that Spirit, is confined wholly to speaking with tongues and working miracles. Is it not so?

LYON.—We have positive testimony that the disciples after they were baptized with the Holy Spirit, were enabled to speak fluently a language that they had never learned! And by the supernatural power which the baptism of the Holy Spirit conferred upon them, they could with ease preach the Gospel to nations whose language hitherto they had been perfectly ignorant of; and by the same power they could demonstrate the truthfulness of their message by performing a miracle in the presence of their hearers. * * * Now as it is an immutable *fact* that like begets like, we therefore conclude that *none* at the present day are baptized with the Holy Spirit.

EXR.—Thus your exact position is seen. Seeing your premises are untenable your conclusion must be also; for we have shown the Spirit was given for other purposes; and we shall now show further, that it was promised to all believers, and was received by all in the apostles' days.

In the ministry of John the Baptist, he testified to the multitudes, "He that cometh after me" *** "shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit." Baptize *who?* Was it to be a few? say the apostles and a few others, that they should "speak fluently a language they had never learned"? &c. Does John make such a restriction? No, indeed. It is "*you*"—the people who shall receive Him. "He that sent me to baptize with *water*, said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy *Spirit*." See Math. 3 : 11; and John 1 : 26-33.

Jesus said to his followers, before He left them, "I will pray the Father and He shall give you another *Comforter*, that he may abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receeive because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be *in you*." John 14 : 16, 17. Paul saith, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God *dwell* in you." Rom. 8 : 9. Saith John, "The anointing which ye have received of him *abideth* in you." 1 John 2 : 27. Saith Jesus, "If *any man* thirst, let him come unto me and drink: he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters. (This spake he of the Spirit, which *they that believe on him* should receive: for the Holy Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified)." John 7 : 37-39. Thus we see, the gift was for all believers, after Jesus should be glorified.

Acts 5 : 32, Peter saith—"We are witnesses of these things; and so also is the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them who *obey* him." Here is no restriction in the gift of the Holy Spirit: it is to them who obey him; and to obey Him, is to believe on Jesus. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom He hath sent." John 6 : 29. Those "who obey him" receive the Holy Spirit: to them God gives it: yet you, who believe the only way to get into Christ is to be immersed in water, and call that "*obeying* the gospel," strangely conclude —"NONE at the present day are baptized with the Holy Spirit"! Where then is the seal of your obedience? Saith Paul "After ye believed, ye were *sealed* with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. 1 : 13, 14. Hence the apostle charges them, "GRIEVE not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." Eph. 4 : 30. How can we more effectually grieve the Holy Spirit than by denying his work and office, as promised and imparted by the great Head of the church? "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom. 5 : 5. Here the gift of the Holy Spirit is clearly a bestowment on all believers, and for something very different than that of speaking with tongues or working miracles.

"Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is *in* you, which ye have of God." 1 Corth. 6 : 19. A universal gift to believers is clearly marked in this text.—"The *communion* of the Holy Ghost be with you *all*." 2 Corth. 13 : 14. The gift is not for a few tongue-speakers or miracle workers, but for "ALL."

We might go on to multiply texts to any extent, but the samples given will suffice to show the gift of the Holy Spirit—the Comforter—though it enabled some to speak with tongues and work miracles, was not given for that exclusively: that was only a part of the design in its bestowment; and though that use of it has ceased, so far as we know, yet its more important work—such as "the renewing of the Holy Ghost"—its "baptizing into *one* body" all believers—its shedding "the love of God abroad in our hearts"—its "bearing witness with our

spirit, that we are the children of God," &c.,—is still continued to all who truly believe in Jesus.

If some abuse these glorious truths, and pervert them to purposes of fanaticism, shall we cast away the gold with the dross? Because this truth has become "a savor of death unto death" to those who follow their fancies, instead of looking to it that "The Spirit and the Word *agree*," shall we cast away that, without which there is no life from the dead? For, be it remembered, "If"—and only *if*—"the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead *dwell* in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies BY HIS SPIRIT THAT DWELLETH IN YOU." Rom. 8 : 11.

NOTE.—Those who wish to see our view in full on the foregoing subject we hope will read our *Tract* on "THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM." See Catalogue on last page of Cover.—EDITOR.

QUESTIONS ABOUT BAPTISM.

BY H. J. SWEETLAND.

I am firm in the belief that immersion in water is the only mode of baptism as commanded by our Lord, Math. 28 : 19, 20; and Mark 16 : 15, 16. I do not write to provoke controversy, but I have read your pamphlet on the "Essential Baptism," and I wish to ask you, if you have changed your mind in the last fifteen years on this subject? You then said in the Examiner, "We believe baptism is an ordinance of our Lord; and one that should not be neglected." By this I suppose of course, you refer to water baptism; for the baptism of the Holy Spirit is a different thing, if it exists in our day, (which I doubt,) from the baptism of water.

1. REPLY.—We most certainly have "changed" our "mind in the last fifteen years" not only on the baptism question, but on several other things. We are not petrifactive; we have changed, and we expect to do so again, if we see cause. When any person has obtained that position, in this life, that he cannot change any more, he should at once be made a Pope, or sent to a more perfect world, as he is not likely to do much good here, and will be very likely to become an intolerant bigot. We do not believe in changing for the sake of change, nor without mature and patient examination, but never to change, is to make no progress at all: it is to be stereotyped and petrified.

You said, fifteen years ago, "If a man is born of God, we cannot conceive that an emergence from water completes the one birth: if so, how was the dying thief born of God? how were Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets born of God?" I would ask in return, Is the baptism of the Holy Spirit essential to the new birth? If so, how were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the prophets born again? for, according to your own admission, they never had this baptism, for it was not given till after the resurrection and ascension of its author.

2. REPLY.—We think if you had studied our pamphlet on the "Essential Baptism" more carefully, you would have been saved the foregoing inquiry. We state in that pamphlet, "The Holy Spirit was to be communicated to *all* true believers in Jesus, in some MANNER it never had been before Jesus was glorified." Again we say, in that pamphlet, "The FACT that the apostles and others were the subjects of the 'renewal, or regeneration by the Spirit,' *before* the promised baptism of the Spirit, no more proves this baptism was not to be universal, in all believers, after Jesus was glorified, than the fact that O. T. saints 'worshiped the Father in spirit,' proves no change was to take place in the manner and measure of worship, under the new dispensation, opened by Messiah after He should be glorified."

Thus you will see, we distinctly recognized the work of the Spirit under the previous dispensation. We never *admitted* that any man, under any dispensation, could be born again without the Holy Spirit; and David prayed, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." But the O. T. points to a dispensation that was to have a measure of that Spirit that no previous one had; and John the Baptist first announced that this larger measure was placed in the hands of JESUS to administer or bestow on them that should believe on Him. "*This*" administration did not commence till Jesus was glorified, and is essential to divine life now, and to a resurrection from the dead, as we have shown elsewhere. The O. T. saints had this Spirit direct from the Father, in virtue of a Redeemer to come. We have it direct from JESUS GLORIFIED, who has received the gift for men who believe on His name. Both the manner and the measure

differs from its communication to the O. T. saints, though the gift itself is the same. The O. T. saints were still under tutors and governors—carnal rites and ordinances—which were to continue till the time appointed of the Father; or till Christ came with that fullness of the Spirit by which believers should be emancipated, and no longer worship in the oldness of the letter, or law, but worship the Father in the Spirit, without the further use of carnal ordinances. Believers of the O. T. were accepted as children under age; but when the fullness of time came, God sent forth His Son to bring about a state of things in which maturity should be produced that did not exist in any previous age, and to this end gave such a measure of the Holy Spirit, as, in comparison with which, it might be said, the Spirit was not yet—or previously—given, because Jesus had not yet been glorified.

Fifteen years ago, you asked, "Does the new birth now and the new birth in the days of the patriarchs and prophets differ essentially? If not, and they did not have an 'emergence from water,' how can it be shown that in order to the new birth a man must emerge from water?" You said, "If water baptism is essential to the new birth, it was always essential." I ask, if the baptism of the Spirit is essential to the new birth was it not always so? How could patriarchs and prophets be born again without this baptism? Yet it was not given till after the ascension of Christ. It appears to me one is as broad as the other.

3. REPLY.—See our remarks in reply 2; which fully covers the ground of this last question. As your concluding question is of the same character as the two we have replied to, we omit it altogether: a reply would be only to repeat what we have said: but we give your "P. S."

Understand me: I do not believe water baptism, conversion, or Spirit baptism, if it is now administered, are either or all of them the new birth. This I understand to be at the resurrection. The resurrection from the dead is, to my mind, the new birth, and none will be born again but those who have the Spirit of God in the heart; consequently the wicked will not have a resurrection.

RESPONSE.—So we come together at last: "the Spirit of God" is the "ESSENTIAL" thing: call it baptism or what you please; only have *the thing*, without which there is no new birth here nor hereafter. The Scriptures declare, "He"—Jesus—"shall baptize you"—all believers—"with the Holy Spirit."—That is our *internal* "witness" that "we are the children of God;" and without it we shall not be "the children of the resurrection." Who that admits this last item, can doubt, the "*Essential Baptism*" is that of the Spirit?

"CAST FORTH AS AN ABORTION."

THE methods resorted to, by the advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead, to prove their position, show how much they lack in argument. The following effort we take from the *Crisis* of May 12th.

VARIED RENDERINGS OF ISA. 26 : 14, 19.

Verse 14. "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish."

"They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased tyrants, they shall not rise; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them; and all memorial of them thou hast abolished."—*Bishop Lowth's Translation of Isaiah.*

Verse 19. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

"Thy dead shall live; my deceased, they shall rise; awake, and sing ye that dwell in the dust! for thy dew is as the dew of the dawn; but the earth shall cast forth, as an abortion, the deceased tyrants."—*Lowth's Translation.*

"And the earth shall cast out the dead."—As an abortive birth is cast out of the womb, to which the grave is compared (Job 1 : 21.) But as the verb here used does not properly signify to cast out, but to *cast down*, or *cause to fall*."—*Benson's Commentary.*

If then, the deceased tyrants are *cast forth* as an *abortion*, the text teaches most forcibly the resurrection of wicked men to a mortal life again. V. P. SIMMONS.

Danielsonville, Ct.

How exceedingly logical the conclusion of "V. P. Simmons"! Because "the earth shall cast forth, as an abortion, the deceased tyrants—*therefore* "the text teaches most forcibly the resurrection of wicked men to a *mortal life* again"! Did V. P. S. know that an *abortion* is brought forth *dead?* It seems not. Job, however, understood it when he wished he had died at his birth, "Or as a hidden *untimely birth* I HAD NOT BEEN; as infants which *never saw light.*" So God saith of some dead men, "He shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall *never see light.*"—Psa. 49 : 19. Such is an abortion.

The Crisis' correspondent's conclusion squarely contradicts the testimony of JEHOVAH in the 14th verse, which is, those *tyrants* "are dead, they shall NOT LIVE." If then the earth is to cast them out as an abortion, it casts them out *dead*, having not even "a mortal life." Besides, the quotation from Mr. Benson, if of any value, condemns the position of V. P. S.; for it is not "cast out, but to *cast down*, or *cause to fall*." So instead of the dead tyrants coming out of the earth they are *cast down*, and do not get up, at all. That looks just like the truth: "they are deceased, they shall not rise." What is the next resort of the TORMENT theorists?

DOES CHRIST RESTORE ALL THAT ADAM LOST?

That is: Does the second Adam restore to the whole race what the first lost? The advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead perpetually insist that Christ does restore it; and say, "Justice demands that our *natural* life should be *restored* to us;" because, "man lost natural life through Adam."

If there is any value in this position, "justice demands that" *all* man lost by Adam should be restored. Let us see where such a theory will land its advocates.

1. Adam lost innocence. That must be restored. 2. Adam lost access to the tree of life. That must be restored. 3. Adam lost Paradise. That must be restored. 4. He lost life. That must be restored. Must we all have a trial in Paradise, with access to the tree of life, because Adam had, and lost it for us? If the reasoning of our opposers is worth any thing, such must be the result. Are they prepared to take this ground? They must take it or fail utterly in their position, that because Adam lost life for his posterity "justice demanded" it "should be restored."

Our Lord Jesus Christ, glorified, saith—"To him that *overcometh*, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." Hence, if men do not overcome, they will not have access to the tree of life; and if justice will allow of their being excluded from one thing Adam lost, it may of all the other things, including "natural life;" especially, as they have had opportunity to regain all that was

lost, under a dispensation where, if sin has abounded, grace has much more abounded: so that, if men regain nothing Adam lost the fault is their own, and justice is unimpeachable in refusing to restore any thing lost by Adam, seeing they have personally treated with neglect or contempt the proffered benefits offered them freely.

This plea of Justice's demanding the restoration of natural life, from the dead, breaks down under its own weight; for God never does restore the natural life, even to the righteous: they do not come from the dead in that way, but by "the Spirit of Him who raised up Christ from the dead." So natural life is not restored to them, and *in*justice is done the righteous, if our opposers' assumption is valid.

The truth is, God gives to all men natural life now, shortly to end eternally. If this life is improved as God requires, He has promised another life, by another life-principle, which shall never fail. No other life has He promised: and life is never threatened, nor inflicted as a punishment. To say it is, is about equal to saying, "Ye shall not *utterly* die:" which is Bishop Law's translation. Sinners by rejecting or neglecting the method God has appointed for their recovery from sin and death, are "holden with the cords of their sins:" and death reigns eternally over them; not because of Adam's sin, but because they refuse or neglect God's proffered mercy for their recovery. Is this not "justice"?

ELD. T. M. PREBLE AND THE WICKED DEAD.—Our readers will recollect we published an inquiry by Eld. Preble on John 5: 28, 29. It seems he overlooked the article and wrote us, after the June EXAMINER had reached him, stating we had "not yet noticed" his "questions," and "wished to know whether" we "intended to do so, if not" he proposed "to have them appear in some other paper." We informed him, he would find his article in the May Exr. He then wrote us, quoting a portion of his previous article, which we think unnecessary to print again, except the question itself and our reply. Our readers can turn to the May number and read his article, if they wish to refresh their memories. Eld. Preble's question was thus stated:

"Now please tell us how '*the wicked*' can 'HEAR HIS VOICE,' and 'COME FORTH,' (! !) if they never 'LIVE AGAIN' !"

In reply we answered :

"IF BRO. PREBLE will tell our readers how the '*dry bones*' of Ezk. 37th, '*hear* the word of the LORD,' and 'COME *together*, bone to his bone,' he will fully answer his question." To this he now replies as follows :

Thank you, Bro. Storrs, for referring the answer of the above question to me, as it is ready, easy and plain. Now let us "*hear*" the word of the LORD as found in Ezek. 37th : "Thus saith the Lord GOD unto these bones : Behold I will cause *breath*" (yes, BREATH,) "to enter into you, and ye shall LIVE" ! Yes, LIVE ! Good. Not much mystery in this, for it is quite common for those who are "*alive*," to "*hear* !" But would it not be rather an uncommon, or mysterious thing for a *dead* man to "HEAR" the word of the Lord !

So we would now "tell our readers" that the "*dry bones*" of Ezek. 37th, will "HEAR *the word of the Lord*,' and "*come together*," just the same as "ALL *that are in the graves*" will "HEAR" his voice, and "COME FORTH" ! In both instances the Lord GOD "*will cause breath to enter into*" them, and they "SHALL LIVE" ! Therefore, when GOD says they "SHALL LIVE" ! let us be careful and not say, They SHALL NOT LIVE ! !

Concord, N. H., June 3, 1863. T. M. PREBLE.

We confess ourself utterly unable to see any force in Elder Preble's comment on Ezk. 37. Did the dry bones *hear* the word of the LORD and *obey before* any breath was imparted to them ? Manifestly, they did, and "*came* together, bone to his bone : and while I beheld," saith the Prophet, "lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above ; but there was NO BREATH *in them*." This is the point Elder P. should have met ; but he jumps it in triumph, and exclaims, "Yes, LIVE ! Good. Not much mystery in this, for it is quite common for those who are *alive* to *hear*" !

But mark well, the dry bones were not alive ; but they did hear ; for "there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones *came* together ;" and yet up to the time the sinews, flesh and skin covered them there was "NO *breath* in them"—they were *not* ALIVE at that point ; and it required a call of the Prophet on the wind—*ruah*, spirit—by an additional command of GOD, in order for *life* to be there. Does not every one see, the fact that they afterwards lived does not solve the question at all, how they heard and obeyed when there was no breath in them ?

It is, indeed, a "rather uncommon, or mysterious thing for a *dead* man to '*hear*' the word of the Lord !" but that mysterious thing happened to the dry bones, and Eld. P. has not begun to

prove the contrary. The fact that they should afterwards live, does not touch the question. THEY DID HEAR, and OBEY ; and that *before* they were alive. If these "dry *bones* of Ezk. 37, will hear the word of the Lord and *come together*, just the same as ALL that are in the graves will hear his voice and *come forth*," as Eld. T. affirms, then ALL that are in the graves will come forth having "*no* BREATH IN THEM ;" and hence will not be alive at that time : and not till the breath, or spirit, enters into them will they live ; and then the question arises has God said He will put it in them whether righteous or wicked ? Certainly in Ezk., it was God's "people," and they ONLY, into whom breath entered. Eld. P. says, in triumph :

"When GOD says they 'SHALL LIVE' ! let us be careful and not say They SHALL NOT LIVE ! !

Yes, but where has God said, the wicked dead shall live ?—Just give us one such text. He has said of some of them, "They are dead, *they shall* NOT *live* :" and we had better be careful and not say, THEY shall live," lest we "make God a liar." See Isa. 26 : 14, and 1 John 5 : 10.

Returning to Ezk. 37 : Who are the persons into whom breath shall enter ? Are they the wicked dead ? Let God himself answer.

"Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel : behold they say, Our bones are dried and our hope is lost :" * * * "therefore prophecy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God ; Behold, O MY PEOPLE, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel : and ye shall know that I am the LORD, when I have opened your graves, O MY PEOPLE, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put MY SPIRIT in you, and ye shall live, and I will place you in your own land : then shall ye know that I the LORD have spoken it and performed it, saith the LORD." Ezk. 37 : 11–14.

Thus we see, it is God's "people," and they *only*, that He says shall live ; and that, too, by His putting His "Spirit in them." We think it will be a more difficult matter to prove the promise of life from the dead covers the wicked, than any of our opposers have yet dreamed of. "They are dead, they shall not live ; they are deceased, they shall not rise :" * * * "Thy dead men shall live ; together with my dead body shall they arise :

awake and sing," &c. Isa. 26 : 14, 19. Eld. P., we trust, will now see the propriety of our referring him to Ezk. 37, in our note to his previous article. Whether he has made the matter "easy and plain," we leave our readers to judge.

H. W. BEECHER.—THE ATONEMENT.

BY MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS, SHELLROCK, IOWA.

To Editor of Exr.—Reading your extract—in the Aug. Exr. for 1862—from a sermon by H. W. Beecher—characteristic alike of the current Trinitarian Theology and the man—revived the long-entertained purpose of commenting on a declaration found in his sermon in the *Independent*, of Nov. 21st, 1861, on the text, "Wherefore he is able to save," &c., Heb. 7 : 25. After speaking of the various theories on the subject of Christ's suffering—why it was necessary—what it effected, and so forth, from the days of Origen to the present time, he comes down to what he says is the "current theory" of those with whom he "most sympathises in faith"—the New School Theologians—the Congregationalists—*viz.*, "That the sufferings and death of Christ were necessary, in order that God might vindicate his justice before the public sentiment of the universe." Then follows the passage containing the declaration I wish to notice, which I will quote entire. He says :—

"I do not say that it is not so, only how did you find it out? Do you ask *me* then on what ground *I* put the necessity for the sufferings of Christ? This is my whole faith on the subject, the New Testament teaches that there was a reason which made it necessary that the blood of one should be shed, to atone for the sins of men. *That reason is not explained.* I learn in the New Testament that it was needful that my God in Jesus Christ should suffer for *me.* I accept the *fact* with reverence and gratitude, but I do not seek to know on this point, what the *New Testament has not explained;* and the example of those who have attempted to explain it, has left me with less disposition to make the attempt."

What am I, that I should undertake to gainsay the declaration of one from whom so much can be learned, as the author of the above? Yet if such passages as the following do not declare the fact that Jesus died and the reason of the fact—what do they mean?

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage." Heb. 2 : 14, 15. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions, under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. 9 : 15. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, *that* he might bring us to God." 1 Peter 3 : 18.

With deference I would say, the foregoing passages, and others that might be named of kindred import, seem to me not only to declare the necessity of Christ's suffering for us, but the reason for that necessity—*viz.*, That He might destroy death, and the devil: and deliver them, &c.,—that by means of death He might deliver them from the transgressions under the first Testament, and thereby bring us to God, &c.

Unlike the faith and resignation which does not seek to know what the distinguished author of the foregoing extract says *has* not been explained, I have allowed what I conceive to be the importunate God-implanted *why* and *how* that would not be put off, to pry into the reason—eagerly grasping at anything offered by any of the New Testament writers on the subject, in order to arrive at a solution of the momentous *why?* This I conceive is the difference—There is no reason to expect to find unless we seek. Inexplicable and incomprehensible, according to his belief; simple and consistent, according to the Bible theory. Man is mortal and must die. Being first natural—or animal—and following the dictates of his nature—necessarily—he sins involuntarily: for, "the carnal mind is enmity against God; is not subject to His law, neither can it be." But in process of time other powers develop themselves. But of what use? Jesus has abolished death for all (virtually), and it will do to talk about *eternal life.* 'Tis His to redeem from the unavoidable fate awaiting all—and bring it within reach of all on condition that they believe on him and show their faith by living as He lived, instead of living as heretofore after the flesh. The great Mediator says—Believe on me—I will suffer for you; henceforth your only guilt shall be rejecting me; which if you do, you must die in your sins, and the wrath of God will abide on you; but if you connect yourself to Me, thereby partaking of the Divine Nature, I will raise you up to everlasting life. On the theory that Jesus is God—man is immortal—dying is living a great deal more and better than when alive, no wonder that so many great and good men have given this "question of ages" such conflicting and extravagant explanations; or, wiser still, like the author of the extract above, none at all. May the question come home—Who is to blame for its non-solution?

OUR FAULTS.—"Confess your faults one to another," is an injunction not difficult to comply with, and yet very few seem willing to do so, and fewer still can bear to be told of their faults. In this world of vanity and infirmities, no one is perfect in the true sense of the word. We all have our faults; some little imperfections in our composition, though slight they may be; still they are marks against us. Yet it is a rare thing, even among the very best of us, to meet with one who can bear to be told his faults, or caught confessing them to be such.—True, there are some who appear patiently to endure reproof, and will thank you for having administered it; but in a majority of cases, they will even then by their manner show their displeasure in some form. No, we cannot bear to be told of our faults. Neither are we willing to allow to others the credit which we claim for ourselves; for if our neighbor chance to commit any indiscretion, or by any word or deed unveil his faults, we at once take delight in proclaiming them abroad, and seek an early opportunity of reminding him of them in a spirit anything but generous, or well calculated to cause a reform.

The wide circle of society is diversified by an endless variety of dispositions, characters and passions. Every one is marked by some peculiarity, which distinguishes him from another, and nowhere can two persons be found who are in all respects alike. While so much diversity exists, it cannot but happen that men in their intercourse with each other, will often find cause for disagreement, and will charge others with the very faults which they themselves have committed. No grade of society is free from error. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Hence in every station, the highest as well as the lowest, and in every condition of life, public, private and domestic, we find that faults will come in and wrongs will exist in some form. But from whence do these evils arise?—Does not experience whisper to us, it is because we possess so little self-knowledge, and the virtues of humility and forgiveness?

Absolute perfection of understanding is impossible; but we make the nearest approach to it when we have sense to discern and humility enough to acknowledge our own faults. We ought to view our own character with an impartial eye, and learn from our own failings to give the indulgence to others which we claim for ourselves. Common failings are the strongest lessons of mutual forbearance, and should teach us humility and forgiveness. But pride too often turns us from our duty. In the hight of self-estimation we forget what we are, and claim that to which we are not entitled. We are as rigorous to offence as if we had never offended; as slow to forgive as though

we never required it. From this false position let us descend to our proper level, and divest ourselves of self-conceit and uncharitable prejudices. NORMAN A. SMITH.

The above is so perfectly the doctrine of the Saviour, and so much needed to reconcile society generally, and would unite so many among us, as a people, if carried out, in mutual labor for the salvation of the perishing, that I forward it to you for publication, hoping it may prove a benefit to many among us who are at variance. C.

10th Army Corps, *Beaufort, S. C.*

THE OUTGOING AND INCOMING ADMINISTRATION.

WHILE we should be thankful to our Heavenly Father for so good a government as that with which we have been favored, yet amid the din of war and the clashing of party politics; the upheavings of society in all its departments, together with the threatened overthrow of thrones and kingdoms, the student of the Bible can but think of Jehovah's declaration, "I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the Gentiles." If God's word shall not pass till all be fulfilled, then the present dynasties of earth are to give place to something better. While we do not think party politics a subject about which the disciples of Christ should waste their energies, we cannot subscribe to the dogma, that there is no connection between politics and religion. The true Christian is a pure politician. Christianity, in short, is nothing else than politics. It relates purely to the science of the government of earth, and only will have its perfect development and realization when the "kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." (Dan. 7: 27.) And when we speak of this political aspect of the Christian religion, which is thus to culminate, we do not mean that it shall so spread and establish itself by means of present instrumentalities as to give a Christian character to governments now existing, but that the governments of earth are to be dashed in pieces and ground to powder by the kingdom which the God of heaven shall set up (Dan. 2: 44.) This incoming administration is to be a restoration of that which was in the beginning when God made man and gave him dominion over all the earth and over every

living thing which moveth on the earth. God was supreme, Adam his vicegerent, and the offspring of Adam his joint heir to the dominion. "Multiply, replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion." "Let them have dominion." (Gen. 1: 26–28.) The great rebellion entered the garden of Eden, and sin blighted this fair heritage, till God drove man from the garden and guarded the way to the tree of life, that he might return unto the dust. Was not this original kingdom the one which God "prepared from the foundation of the world," and which Christ will give his sheep at the day of judgment? (Matt. 25: 34.)

The great questions which have confused the earth and made it a Golgotha for so many thousand years, have been the right of dominion over the earth. The old usurper, the instigator of rebellion, proclaims himself the monarch of all the kingdoms of earth and all their glory. Thus when the Son of God had been proclaimed from heaven at the banks of Jordan, and was led up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil, among other proposals was this: He "showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time" and said, "All this power will I give thee and the glory; for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine."

The dominion of earth, then, was the question at issue between the Son of God and Satan. The tempting bait of a bloodless possession of the dominion of earth. Rejecting it, as President Lincoln did a similar one, he took up the gauntlet thrown down by the arch rebel, and with full knowledge of the blood which must flow, he proclaimed, "I came not to send peace on earth but a sword. Henceforth there shall be five in one house divided; three against two and two against three." "A man's foes shall be they of his own house." The onset was made on Christ himself, and pursued to the death of the Messiah for his assumption of royal character against the claims of Satan. Since then, uncounted millions for their adherence to their Master's cause have paid the penalty with their lives. This relentless war against the Son of David and his claims to dominion were all foreseen and foretold by him before his crucifixion. And not by him alone, but by the holy prophets who had preceded him. "He shall wear out the saints and prev il against them," said the prophet Daniel. And thus it is to be till the "Ancient of Days shall come, that the saints shall possess the KINGDOM."

Each successive experiment at expurgating the dominions of earth by the introduction of a new and more perfect race and administration has proved abortive.

The first administration was vested in the hands of Adam in his primeval holiness as already shown. But the seducer entered

Eden's happy bowers, and in an evil hour seduced him from his allegiance and duty, and prostrated his dominion in the dust. Things went on from bad to worse, till the earth was filled with violence and every thought and imagination of man's heart was evil, and only evil, and that continually. In this state of things the Lord swept the race, with the exception of one righteous man and his family from the earth, and gave to him, on his emergence from the ark, the dominion of Adam, which in the beginning was vested in him, but with no better success. In the days of Abram and Lot, Sodom and the cities of the plain were so corrupt that not ten righteous persons could be found there, and the storm of fire swept them away. Egypt, and Canaan, too, so debased themselves by rebellion against God that they were given up to destruction. At length God's chosen people, under a government of his own framing, were planted in a good land under the most favorable circumstances, surrounded by such influences as were the best calculated to keep them obedient, but all in vain. The administration of Moses, Joshua, the Judges, Samuel, David and all his descendants, were perverted, till God said, "I will overturn it, and it shall be no more till he comes whose right it is; and I will give it him." Then David's house and Judah's tribe went into captivity, and David's royalty was suspended till the coming of Messiah.

Thus every institution of earthly government has been perverted by Satan from its design to be an agency for good to the human race, to be an engine of oppression.

The institution of government has been of God; its perversion of Satan. He has managed in each instance to obtain the control of affairs to accomplish his own diabolical purposes.

But God's plan of establishing on earth a perfect government is not always to be defeated. He shall yet set up a "kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor be left to other people. But it shall break in pieces and subdue all these kingdoms and stand forever."—*Advent Herald.*

"ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE WITH GOD:"

OR, A RICH MAN MAKING A RIGHT USE OF RICHES.

Rev. Justin Perkins, writing from London to the *Independent*, says:—

Some of our readers may recall the name of William Rawlinson, who last year gave for the American Board, in its straightened circumstances, some three thousand dollars, and was, more-

over, the chief instrument in raising "the crisis fund," so called, for the same object. On my way from Liverpool to London, I turned aside to Taunton, to spend a day with Mr. R., whose acquaintance I made during my former visit in England. Of all mortals whom I know, Mr. R. is one of the most devoted and faithful stewards of the Lord Jesus. He is a wealthy silk manufacturer, employing at present about five hundred persons. He does not allow his capital to increase from year to year, but, after the frugal support of his family, he scrupulously hands back to the Master's use all the "gain" which that Master intrusts to his care.

Mr. R. labors abundantly in word as well as in deed. Himself the personification of modesty, yet equally so of efficiency, he redeems time from superintending his large factories to visit the sick, the suffering, and the dying, and speak to them of Christ and salvation; and the number of committeeships on which he serves, for various religious and charitable objects, it would be difficult to count up.

A rap at my door this morning brought Mr. R. to my room, with the statement, "I have a short religious service at one of my factories every morning at nine o'clock; will you conduct it this morning?" I gladly accepted the proposal, and nine o'clock found us in the factory, surrounded by three hundred operatives, who had just assembled, with their hymn-books in their hands. Mr. Rawlinson read the hymn,

"How sweet the name of Jesus is,"

which was beautifully sung by nearly all present. I then read a short passage from the Bible, on which I remarked a few minutes, and led in prayer. As an extra, on this occasion, they then sung the hymn,

"When shall we all meet again?"

Such a service has been kept up by Mr. R. daily in that factory, for twenty years. Some fifty of the operatives are hopefully pious, and all thus become comparatively intelligent on religious subjects, while the effect of such service to promote order and good character among them, is incalculable. Most of them are females. The younger children attend school half of the day.—There is no working at night, and all have Saturday afternoon to themselves. The establishment is in fact a great Christian family, of which Mr. R. is the revered head.

"You have a great pressure of business on your hands," I said to him, as we were walking to his factory, having in mind the late hour at which he was writing business letters in his family last evening.

"Yes," he replied, "I would curtail my business, and take life easier, but for the purpose of thus doing more for the cause of Christ."

Mr. R., with his thousands at command, occupies a dwelling as humble as the houses of most New England pastors—and very much more so than some of them—while his whole style of living is perfectly plain and simple, though of course more comfortable than the luxurious equipage affected by the most religious men of his means in America.

The Lord bless this faithful steward, beginning with his own household. His five children, ranging between the ages of eight and twenty-three, who are models of gentleness and modesty, are all hopefully pious. And the number of other persons brought to Christ, as I was told in Taunton, through the active labors of this meek and quiet man, is quite large every year. Mrs. R. is a helpmate of her husband; and a happier family I know not in this world.

At Mr. R.'s. family altar America is remembered in his fervent supplications. He, like thousands of Christians in England, pray earnestly that the terrible war may speedily cease, and the abomination of slavery come at once to a perpetual end. I tell these good people to reverse the order of these petitions, and they will better meet the case, as I read the providence of God—the removal of slavery, the cause of the war, being an indispensable antecedent to any practicable settlement of our troubles.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.—"I realize all the time that the Holy Comforter is with me. We never could find our way through this dark world to our heavenly home, had not God given us an infallible guide. The personal, omniscient, omnipotent Holy Spirit is guardian, comforter, and sanctifier. If we 'walk not after the flesh,' but walk after the Spirit, he will lead us safely. He may lead us often 'by a way that we would not,' for if we knew the way we would not so much need a guide; but he will lead us into the paths of righteousness here, and to the fields of glory hereafter.

"It is our blessed privilege to have access to the Holy Comforter, and fellowship with him, as the disciples had fellowship with their incarnate Saviour. We hear this doctrine announced in every benediction—'The communion and *fellowship* of the Holy Ghost be with you all forever'—but how few realize it as it is our blessed privilege! I realize it more and more every year. What the Church especially needs are—perfect loyalty to God, perfect confidence in God, perfect love for God."—*Rev. Wm. Taylor*, writing from Palestine, formerly of Baltimore, Md

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

HELEN ROBERTSON, Oneida Co., N. Y., writes:—Since my last, the "little flock" here has been suffering persecution. The minister called on Sister ——, and denounced her in a very hard spirit. He threatened to excommunicate her and every one who had received the blessed truth of "No life out of Christ." He did not care how many, high or low, rich or poor, all would be turned out; he was determined to root it out of the church. She told him she had been thinking for some time that she had better be separated from his church, and it did not trouble her. He told her she would, from the day of her separation, lose God's smile; that her spiritual life would begin to fail; and warned her to consider.

But let me tell you, before this faith of the Gospel was presented to her and her husband, he was entirely sceptical about the Bible. She, although a member of the said church, saw the absurdity of its doctrines, so that she too was beginning to turn away from the Bible. But now both love the blessed Bible: it is their daily study: they now try to live in exact conformity to its spirit and teachings, and have established a family altar. Her two sisters and mother, are now with us, all rejoicing in hope of the glory of God. My sister was, also, waited on by two of the deacons; but she stood firm. Indeed, she has seemed firmer than before. Another one said, if she was to be denied the privilege of reading and seeing for herself, she had rather be in the Roman Catholic Church. Last evening I talked with two others who have been investigating the truth for a few months. The husband said, this was a consistent theory; it was in accordance with the Bible: the wife said, it was clear to her as noonday sun. Others are searching the Scriptures to see whether these things are so, nothing terrified by the adversaries.

One who communed with us on the 3d of April, has since died. She died with unwavering faith—not of going right to heaven, but of being resurrected immortal at Christ's second coming. Future life *only to the righteous* never seemed to me so scripturally true as when I sat by her bedside—from time to time—reading portions of Scripture to strengthen and enlighten her while going down into the dark valley of the shadow of death. O, who can ever break the binding power of that last enemy but Christ? and for whom will he break that power but his own? Oh, glory to God for light and truth!

I visited, a short time since, a man in Trenton Village. He had studied out the first principles of our faith over fifteen years ago, from the Bible, before becoming acquainted with our writers or people. He has since got some of your works, but is still an independent student. I asked him if he believed there would be future life to the wicked. He said he did not: that that was altogether out of harmony with the plan of salvation. I told him a great many Adventists believed they would live again. He said, that is the old theology. They can't let it go.—They hold on to it, as it were, with one finger. He is over eighty years of age, but very energetic indeed. He subscribes for the Bible Examiner, and wishes it sent from the beginning of the present year. I conclude with the prayer that our God may bless you, and strengthen you to labor for Him.

A. A. BABCOCK, Michigan, writes:—We are living in fearful times: what the end will be I cannot tell. It seems as if oppression must be felt North as well as South. O, how this nation has sinned! The hand of God is laid heavily upon us. What bitter weeping, throughout this whole land, for brothers, fathers, sons! But when the black man wept to us, we heeded it not. Has he not cried to God to avenge his wrongs, and has not God heard him? Truly He has heard his cry, and our children are slaughtered by the oppressor's hand, and we have not humbled ourselves before God and confessed our sin.

I have come to the conclusion, "There is no life out of Christ." I have taken my Bible and commenced at Genesis, taking God's sentence on Adam; the sentence for murder; on the antediluvians, on Sodom, on Lot's wife, and the sentence Ex. 19: 12, 13; and so for every sin man can commit, you will find God passed the sentence of death, and I have yet to learn where He has revoked one of the penalties.

—

J. W. C. GRAY, Esq., Illinois, writes:—The Pamphlets you sent me I have given to various persons to read; some of them to ministers; and they generally think they are the true Gospel. The "Atonement" and the "Essential Baptism" are approved by nearly all who read them. I shall do the best I can for the EXAMINER.

—

W. H. RANDOLPH, Penobscot Co., Maine, writes:—The EXAMINER comes to hand regularly, and I think it the best publication I ever got hold of. Go on publishing the blessed truths of God's word in these last days. Error must fall when the light shines so clear on the Bible. The more we search the old chart, and scour up our armor, the more blessed it looks, and the more blessed it is.

—

J. W. MAFFIT, Hamilton Co., Iowa, writes:—With your permission, I will renew my last year's proposition. I will be one of twenty to give ten dollars each to defray your expenses on a trip as far West as Iowa.

—

FROM HILTON HEAD, S. C., June 9, 1863.—The EXAMINER continues to come to us. It would do your heart good to see with what earnestness its rich contents are read. It is well known in camp, and many are the inquiries to know if it is not time for it to come again. Brother P. says, send this dollar to Bro. Storrs for me, and tell him we feel the cause must be supported, and so must he. That our feelings run pocket deep, you will please find inclosed from me a dollar also. God is with us—whom shall we fear? The narrowness of one paper, and its hard speeches against the Government, which to-day gives it protection, has obliged us to expell it from camp. God bless you; multiply your days of usefulness, and give you grace and strength to yet stand in the front of the battle. While I write a fellow soldier comes into our tent and says, "I must take the EXAMINER, and here is a dollar for it."

—

ALVAH METCALF, Mass., writes:—I have taken a class in the Sabbath School, and offered to give the BIBLE EXAMINER to as many as would

come. There were eight last Sabbath, and I think there will be more. I send eight dollars, for which send as many copies of the Examiner as you can. I may send for more.

THE EDITOR, since the last issue of the EXAMINER, has spent one Sabbath in New-York—two in Springfield, Mass, and two in Newark, N. J., with much satisfaction to himself; and so far as he can judge, with profit to the people. He has not failed to hold up "*Life only in Christ*," without disguise. He has nothing to hide or to fear in the promulgation of this glorious doctrine. It needs only to be understood to commend itself to the candid and unprejudiced mind: not that he means to say no such minds will feel difficulties in embracing this view; but he does mean to say, that the doctrine itself looks so *like* GOD, and makes such a harmony in the Divine character, and so perfectly agrees with all the other branches of the life theme, that they cannot but feel, *if it is true*, it is the crowning glory of the whole system, and invests it with such uniformity and harmony as it cannot have without it. He intends to labor patiently and perseveringly in its promulgation, forbearing those who differ with him, only asking of them to manifest the same spirit toward himself; otherwise, how can they justly claim our fellowship? If they will, as some have, persistently and reproachfully cry "*hobby*," and the like, can they calculate on our respect, to say nothing of our Christian fellowship? The fact is, no man, in any department in life, ever accomplished any thing of much importance, who had not a "hobby." One man never yet had a capacity to excell in many things, except in extraordinary cases. Each man has his gift of God, and it is peculiar to himself: that gift he must employ on the object, business, or calling for which it is given: and one great reason why there are so many failures, mechanically, civilly, ecclesiastically, and otherwise, is, men mistake their gift or calling, or divide it on too many objects, so that they excell in nothing, and comparatively, accomplish nothing for themselves or the world. Let those who cry "*hobby*" against what they do not like, because, it may be, their minds have not yet been open to grasp the subject, remember an apostle has said, "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." You have no more right to call your brother's gift a "*hobby*," by way of reproach, than he has to do the same to you. Let every one improve his own gift; but do it in love, not in a spirit which would compel every other to submit to his mode or method, or be visited with reproachful names. The cry of "hobby," as used by our opposers, is manifestly designed to cast reproach on the advocates of "*Life only in Christ.*" We ask them to cease from the use of it, if they wish to command our respect and Christian regard. If they mean simply what the word truly imports, *viz.*, "*A favorite object*," say so. Our "favorite object" is to make all men see there is life *only* in Christ for dying men; and that that life is a *divine* life, and can only be had by a living union with Him by faith—"The just shall live by faith." Without this faith in, and union with Christ there is "*no life* in" men, or for men, beyond this present scene of trial: if they will not come to Christ "for life" they will "utterly perish in their own corruption." Such is our firm and unshaken belief: the promulgation of which we cannot neglect without the conviction of unfaithfulness to God and men.

DISCUSSION IN BOSTON.—Joseph T. Curry recently invited Miles Grant to a discussion, in public oral debate, of the question, "*Do the Scriptures teach the Resurrection of the Wicked?*" The invitation was accepted, and the parties mutually agreed that the discussion should be held in Kast Building, Boston, on the evenings of June 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th; that each disputant should speak twice each evening; and that the speeches should be twenty-two minutes in length.

The discussion has been held in accordance with the foregoing arrangement, Bro. Grant assuming the affirmative, Bro. Curry the negative, and Prof. C. F. Hudson acting as Moderator.—Large audiences attended the debate, and much interest was manifested in the doctrine up for investigation. The disputants maintained a kind, Christian bearing towards each other from first to last, and nothing occurred to mar the interest of the occasion.

The Debate was phonographically reported by Bro. E. P. Woodward, of Boston, and will be immediately *published*, by

Bro. Curry, in pamphlet form. This arrangement has the cordial approbation of Bro. Grant, and as soon as the Debate is out of press its price will be announced in the *Crisis*, when we hope it will be largely ordered and read by the friends on both sides of the controversy.

We shall have something further to say respecting the Discussion, in the EXAMINER, when it is published.

June 13, 1863. R. W.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We shall have a full supply of the foregoing *Discussion* as soon as it is ready; and though we do not yet know the price, those who wish us to furnish it to them may send their orders and the amount of funds they wish to invest in the work, and we will supply them at the earliest period possible. Though we have not seen it, we have the fullest confidence it cannot fail to interest all persons who are disposed to investigate the question. We join in the wish of "R.W." that it may "be largely ordered and read." The expense of *reporting* and printing will be heavy on the party of the "negative," as he took the whole responsibility of the Report on himself. Let him not bear the burden alone.

P. S. Since the foregoing was in type, we have received information that the work is in the Printer's hands, and will soon be ready for delivery. *Price*, 25 cents: postage, three cents. The usual discount will be made to those who buy to sell again. We suggest, that those who wish a quantity send the amount of money they wish to invest, directed to "JOSEPH T. CURRY, care of *O. Clapp*, No. 30 & 32 Winter-St., *Boston*, Mass.;" and that they send immediately, as only a limited number will be printed.

DONATIONS FOR THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—W. S. Olmsted, his "monthly," $1. I. S. Small, $1. "Once a month," $1. A. W. Pierce (in army, S. C.) $1. Wm. Wright, $1. David Rollins, $5.

THE JUNE EXAMINER.—A few copies of that number can still be had, if wanted. We can also supply *perfect sets* to new subscribers from January. Bound and *un*bound volumes for 1860 and '61 and '62—or Vols. 13 and 14—can still be furnished to those who desire them.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

THIS *Magazine* is devoted mainly to Bible questions; specially to the great themes of JESUS CHRIST'S personal return to, and reign on earth—Life, future and eternal, only through Him—and literal death, never to be revoked, as the wages of sin.

It is intended to be issued *Monthly*, 32 pages octavo. TERMS, *One Dollar* for 12 numbers; paid in *advance*.

REMITTANCES.—Persons making communications to us, will please consider it a *receipt* for money they send, if they receive what they write for, instead of our acknowledging their letters in the EXAMINER. Generally, in case of remittance, they receive what they order before the acknowledgment could appear in our Magazine. To *print* all the names of Correspondents is attended with inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

LETTERS should be well sealed, but never "registered." Money for the EXAMINER is at the *Editor's* risk, when sent as herein directed, without adding to, or omitting any thing from the directions. If this course is not complied with, it is at the risk of the person remitting.

MONEY sent for any of the works in our *Catalogue* of Books, is at the risk of the *purchaser*, except when the *retail* price is remitted, then it shall be *mutual*. The risk is small, if our instructions are strictly followed; we will not be responsible in any degree unless this is done. Be careful, in all cases, not to send depreciated Bank bills. We have had to pay *twenty* per cent. on some funds sent us, or else return the money. This ought not to be.

THE POSTAGE on the *bound* Examiner, for 1860, is *twenty-six* cents, any distance less than 3000 miles.

☞ We invite our friends to examine the *Catalogue* of works, on the last page of this cover, and send for such as they can make profitable to themselves or others. By doing this, you will benefit the cause we advocate, and help the EDITOR of this Magazine.

Invariably address, GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New-York*.

———:o:———

STANDING RULES FOR WRITERS FOR THIS MAGAZINE.

1. Each writer is required to state his own views on the topic he takes up, without a direct personal controversy with any other writer in our columns. This course does not restrict liberty of expression on any topics others have presented, but is designed to save personal feelings.

2. Each individual correspondent is *alone* responsible for the sentiments of his article: the fact of the insertion is not to be construed as an approval by the EDITOR.

3. The main object of this Magazine, as expressed on its cover, must be kept in view by all writers: other topics may, however, sometimes be admitted. if space will allow.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS:

FOR SALE AT THE BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

On all books and pamphlets, sent by mail, the postage has to be *pre-paid.* The following works will be sent, any distance under 3000 miles, postage free, on receipt of the retail price; except the *bound* EXAMINERS.

SIX SERMONS on the inquiry, *Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering?* To which is added a sermon on *Christ the Life-giver*, or the faith of the Gospel, by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner;* with an Introduction defending the Bible and its Author against Infidels. This work contains double the amount of matter of the original Six Sermons. *Price*, in plain binding, 50 cents; in paper covers, 30 cents.

THE WATCH TOWER: OR, MAN IN DEATH; *and the Hope for a Future Life.*—A Pamphlet of 96 pages. A thorough cure for the modern *necromancy*, misnamed "*spiritualism*," which is really *animalism*. *Price*, 20 cents.

LIFE FROM THE DEAD; or, *The Righteous only will live again.* By the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner.* The author believes this subject is one of vast importance. It illustrates the whole Gospel scheme, and shows the mercy of God in its true light, while man is seen to be wholly mortal. It cuts up the modern *man-worship*, which is hurrying so many on to rank atheism. *Price*, 20 cents.

LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.—This embraces the whole of the three previous named works, and the Tract on Atonement, bound in one volume of 360 pages, and lettered on the back. It contains a full view of the doctrine of "*No life out of Christ*," as held by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner.* *Price*, $1.

MAN'S DESTINY.—*Immortality:* The Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D.D., St. Louis, Mo., *Reviewed* by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner.* A very valuable work. *Price*, in pamphlet, 30 cents.

BIBLE VS. TRADITION: in which the True Teaching of the Bible is manifested: showing the true meaning of the terms *Soul, Spirit, Hell, Everlasting, Eternity, Life, Death*, &c. An invaluable help to understanding the Scriptures. *Price*, bound, 75 cents. A cheap edition, in paper covers, 40 cents.

OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN.—This work was written by Prof. WILSON, England, some years since. We republished it, believing it could not fail to interest all thinking men, whatever might be thought of the accuracy of its positions. For ourself, we indorse the general theory that the *Anglo-Saxons* are the literal descendants of Israel, in the line of Joseph and Ephraim. Price, 50 cents, in paper covers only.

BIBLE EXAMINER *bound;* Vol. 13, $1.75. Vol. 14, $1.85. This includes the postage: $1.50 each without the postage.

TRACTS AND SMALL WORKS.

MAN'S NATURE AND DESTINY; or, the Animal man and the Spiritual man. A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 5 cents.

LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN; or, Life only through Christ, not a heresy; by Dr. J. K. FINLEY, Pittsburgh, Pa. *Price*, 5 cents.

THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM; by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner.* *Price*, 7 cents.

THE ATONEMENT: by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 3 cents.

DOOM OF THE UNGODLY; or, *The Wicked Dead remain eternally under death's dominion.* A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price*, 5 cents.

Other Tracts will be added, if funds are to be had.

Orders for any of these works may be left with GEO. W. YOUNG, 35 Ann-St., New York.

All *Letters* sent by mail, must be addressed,

GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New York.*

SEPTEMBER.

Vol. XV. PUBLISHED MONTHLY. 1863.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES."—JESUS.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR.

TERMS:

One Dollar per Vol. of 384 Pages. Single Numbers, of 32 Pages, 13 Cts.

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR:

POST OFFICE ADDRESS, BOX 4658,

NEW-YORK.

Contents of the September Number.

1. HOLINESS,.....257
2. LIFE FROM THE DEAD,.....261
3. THE JUDGMENT: HEB. IX. 27, 28,.....267
4. NO LIFE OUT OF CHRIST,.....269
5. REPHAIM,.....274
6. A "LESSON" OF DOGMATISM,.....279
7. CHRISTIAN DEPORTMENT,.....287
8. LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST: A NEW ERA.....289

REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS TO EXAMINER.

RUFUS WENDELL, *Salem*, Mass
JOSEPH T. CURRY, *Boston*, Mass.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"THIS IS THE RECORD, THAT GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, AND THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON. HE THAT HATH THE SON, HATH LIFE; AND HE THAT HATH NOT THE SON, HATH NOT LIFE."

Vol. 15. No. 9.] **SEPT., 1863.** [Whole No. 228.

HOLINESS.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THIS subject has been much obscured by an erroneous method of explaining its philosophy. Its discussers, from John Wesley down to the various contributors to the periodicals of the present day, which are exclusively devoted to its treatment, appeal only to the inward exercises (commonly called "experience") of individuals for data. To us, this seems a great mistake.—Holiness is a *Scripture* doctrine, and should be elucidated by arguments drawn *from* the Scriptures. The testimony of individuals is worthless except as it reflects the teaching of the Scriptures. Fir st the proof, then the illustration; first "the law and the testimony," next the corroboration from experience.

The Apostle Paul exhorted the Hebrews to follow holiness, affirming that without it "no one (*oudeis*) shall see the Lord." Modern theorists endeavor to prove that this "holiness" is an advanced state of Christian experience; and that a person may be "justified by faith," and yet be a stranger to "holiness." This position is simply monstrous; for "no one can see the Lord" without "holiness;" and if a justified person is not necessarily holy, it will follow that a justified person may be lost! This fundamental error forces a logical mind to reject the theory taught by Wesley and others. We are all the more willing to "search the Scriptures" for information concerning this topic, inasmuch as we have observed that those who are the firmest in their dependence on mere "experience" are the most obstinate adherents of the unscriptural dogma of the immortality of the soul, with its hideous result, eternal torment.

"Experience" is their god, and they will receive no doctrine which does not tally with it. Our motto, on the contrary, shall be: The truth of God as revealed in His word, whether it agrees with our experience or not. "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

What is holiness? The Greek word *hagiasmos* is from *hagiazō*, which is found in the Septuagint version of the O. T. for the Hebrew verb *qadash;* which signifies "1. *to be pure, clean,* pr. of physical purity and cleanness....Hence 2. *to be holy, sacred.*"—Gesenius. Thus the word *holiness* primarily means *physical purity,* but has acquired a *moral* definition. The question arises, Whence came the moral definition? Who gave the word this higher import? As the idea of moral purity is not natural, it must have come directly from God. When it came from God it was expressed by a word or words. The earliest use of the Hebrew word by God in his communication with man is recorded Exodus 3 : 5. When Moses turned aside to see the burning bush, God said, "Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is HOLY ground." The word *holy* here receives its moral meaning. The ground was holy, not because it was essentially different from the contiguous soil, but simply in consequence of the association of the moment. GOD was there. Here, then, we have the corner-stone of the doctrine of holiness. Its standard, its essence, its exemplar, is the Almighty. He says, "I the Lord your God am holy." Lev. 19 : 2. He is the "Holy Father." John 17 : 11.

God having constituted himself the standard of holiness, we are interested to know the distance between His nature and ours, that we may understand how far we naturally come short of that "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord."—God's nature was declared by Jesus in his conversation with the Samaritan woman. "God is *spirit.*" (*pneuma ho Theos.*)—John 4 : 24. Such is *not* man. "That which is begotten of the flesh is *flesh.*" John 3 : 6. *Another* generation is necessary to make man a "partaker of the Divine nature." "That which is begotten of the Spirit is spirit." Man by nature is *flesh*—no more, no less. God by nature is spirit.

In Cor. 15 we have further evidence that man is "flesh and not spirit." "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual

body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; ["God gave him such life as other animals enjoy." Wesley's Notes,] the last Adam was made a quickening *spirit.* Howbeit that was not *first* which is *spiritual,* but that which is *natural;* and *afterward* [the second Adam, Jesus] that which is *spiritual.* The *first* man is of the *earth,* earthy." Vs. 44-47. Thus the popular doctrine of man's inherent spirituality is false; and with it falls its consequence, inherent immortality. God's nature is totally distinct from that of man; the one is spirit, and spiritual; the other is flesh, and soulical. God "only hath immortality;" "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." 1 Tim. 6 : 16. Eccl. 3 : 19. Hence, if God calls His nature holy, he condemns man's nature as lacking holiness.—Paul finds in this conflict of the spiritual and natural the secret of the condemnation. He says, "The law is *spiritual:* but I am *carnal* [fleshly], sold under sin." "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 7 : 14; 8 : 7.

In view of these things, how utterly absurd is the theological talk about Adam's original *holiness.* God "made" (1 Cor. 15 : 45) him not spiritual or holy, but wholly *animal,* without the first particle of spirituality. "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is *natural.*" And this was Adam's normal condition. Being purely natural, the statement in 1 Cor. 2 : 14 was as true in his case as in that of his posterity: "The *natural* man receiveth *not* the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither *can* he know them, because they are *spiritually* discerned." Hence, the trial in the garden of Eden could have but *one* result—the demonstration of the total incapacity of the animal man to keep a law which arrayed itself against his *natural* instincts. But some one will say, "Then the trial was a mockery." We answer, Was the trial of Jesus a mockery? And yet *His* trial could have but *one* result—the demonstration of the complete harmony which exists between the spiritual law and the spiritual nature. The first Adam's trial showed the lack of holiness in his nature; the second Adam's showed the holiness of His nature. The "living soul" was condemned; the "quickening spirit" was justified. And the Almighty foreknew the inevitable result of each trial. God's object in each case was to inform *man,* not

Himself. Looking back to the garden of Eden, Adam and his posterity have seen their *natural* unfitness for a future life.—But in connection with the sentence of condemnation God made a promise to Adam of a future seed, "a child of hope." This child, Jesus of Nazareth, has exhibited to the world His fitness for a future life and the fitness of all those who through faith prove themselves worthy of being made like Him. Hence, we contend that Adam and Eve had the *offer* of salvation. Whether they accepted it or not we do not affirm.

Absolute holiness cannot be ours until we are made "like Him." 1 John 3 : 2. What then is meant by the command, "Be ye holy"? Lev. 11 : 44, 45 ; 19 : 2 ; 20 : 7, 26. *Relative* holiness is here referred to. The man who prefers the will of God to the will of the flesh, and accepts the helper which God offers—the Holy Spirit—and is determined to "walk after the Spirit," to struggle against the animal nature and "bring it into subjection," is *accounted* holy in this life ; it is not what he *is* that is considered, but what he aims *to be*. "For we through the Spirit *wait* for the hope of righteousness by faith." Gal. 5 : 5. Hence, Paul was *relatively* holy when he cried out, "O wretched man that I am." He saw his condemned state as an animal man and groaned for the time when he should be delivered from the "body of death."

The holiness of man in this life is simply a development of character. It consists in the cultivation of a preference for the spiritual. Whenever a person resolves to break from the thraldom of the flesh and welcomes the Spirit of God as an abiding inmate of his heart, he becomes essentially holy. He has "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." The business of his life is to "follow after" that which he has espoused. Hence, many persons who are totally unacquainted with the parade of words used by the would-be expounders of holiness are immensely in advance of them in reality. How many, who talk of "sanctification" obstinately oppose the plainest teachings of the Bible! The mortality of the whole man, the utter destruction of the wicked, the dependence of man on a resurrection from the dead for a future life, the personal and speedy coming of Christ, and other doctrines of great moment are ignored and denied by the great majority of those whose ideas of holiness are founded on their own "experience" and

that of others. They cry out to Christ, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked ;" but they disregard the answer that comes back, "Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the *Word* of *God*, and *keep* it."

The *Bible* measure of holiness is the true one. The first act required of the inquirer is *belief*. Not belief in some *theory* of *experience*, but belief of *the truth*. "*Sanctify* them," said the Master. How? By a peculiar *experience?* Nay! "Sanctify them through thy *truth ;* THY WORD is truth." The seekers after holiness ask, "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" The reply is significant: "*This* is the work of God, that ye *believe* on him whom He hath sent." Well, who has been sent? *Ans.* "The true bread from heaven." "And Jesus said unto them, *I* am the bread of *life*....This is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should *raise it up again at the last day*. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have *everlasting life :* and *I will raise him up at the last day*." If a person believes *this* statement, he cannot believe the immortality of the soul. *Here* Bible holiness *begins*. Faith! Faith in Christ!—Faith in Christ as the *Life*-giver! "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." What have we to do, then, but to follow after holiness—practice that which is commenced in faith?

LIFE FROM THE DEAD.

UNDER the head of "*The Resurrection of Condemnation*" Prof. C. F. HUDSON has recently published five articles. We have no intention of reviewing them, being willing they should carry all the weight they are entitled to ; but as he published an article in the BIBLE EXAMINER in 1857, pp. 122–125—to which we made no reply at the time—and has now reproduced that article entire in his recent effort in defence of the resurrection of the unjust or wicked dead, we have thought best to place some extracts from it again before our readers that they may judge of the value of his position on the question. He speaks as follows—

"I will offer what I regard as the true view of the resurrection of the unjust, and, taking the doctrine out of its old theological connection, will try to give it a new setting, in which it may even reflect the divine goodness and love." ***

"Respecting the resurrection of the unjust, then, I can heartily say that *if they are raised up for the sake of being punished*, then I know not how to vindicate the *goodness* of God. He might be *just*, but He would not appear great or magnanimous." ***

"The wicked dead are raised, then, *not for the sake of* their punishment. Rather, 'the second death' is the *result* of their resurrection; and the *reason* or *design* of that resurrection is to be sought elsewhere. The Bible never speaks of the wicked as being raised up *in order* that they may be punished, or that God may collect his dues in their sufferings, or for any other need of justice. The justice of the Infinite, or of the Universe, is not so poor as this."

Thus he seems to reject, entirely, the idea held by all, or nearly all future *torment* theorists, that the wicked dead are raised in order to, or for the sake of inflicting torment on them as a punishment. If this point is accepted as truth, a very natural inquiry is, For what then are they recalled from death, when *once* dead? He responds as follows—

"The resurrection of the wicked is rather, in common with that of the righteous, the effect and the token of man's deliverance from the power of death. It comes as the natural sequel of man's rescue from that doom—of his release from that bondage—of his redemption from that condemnation—of a proclaimed remission of the sins that are past, and a respite granted, so that personal faith and union to Christ alone are now wanting, that the new life-power may be a life possession, an inheritance of immortality. The prison doors are opened, and the convict is let out to see the light of day. He is told that the sentence of the law is annulled, so far as God is concerned—he has only to accept the Deliverer as his Lord, and death hath no more power over him. And though in this figure we date the *time* for the sinner's choice after the limit which God has fixed, yet it may illustrate the actual relations of the Redemption and the Resurrection. The latter appears to us the natural outgrowth of the higher life-power which accompanies the former."

That is, if we understand his last remark, "The Resurrection" is "the *natural* outgrowth of the higher life-power which accompanies Redemption." In other words, the life-power in redemption has so far affected the sinner, that, though he dies in his sins, this divine life-power is so inwoven in him, some how, that it *naturally* brings the sinner up from the dead: yet, strange to tell, this divine life-power is not strong enough to keep him alive, but a second dying is the "result of life"

from the dead. Or, the sinner has received, in this life, just enough of the "higher life-power" to open his "prison doors" and be "let out to see the light of day," and to know what he might have had if he had improved the means employed to bring him the full strength of the higher life-power.

If such a manifestation is not "*being punished*," it would seem difficult to tell what punishment is: and if it is not being "*raised up for the sake of being punished*," we cannot see for what "sake" it is. All that is to result from it, according to this statement, has been revealed to the sinner before his death; and the Prof. is obliged to make his "figure date the *time* for the sinner's choice after the limit which God has fixed." Surely, one would suppose that fact would have opened his own eyes to see he had placed the sinner where God has not placed him, and where there is, therefore, no warrant for himself or any other man to place him. We regard the Prof., however undesignedly, as having clearly reversed God's order in His manifestation of the work and order of redemption: that manifestation is not *after* this life, but *in* this life: and it is only those who believe on the Son of God—where He is proclaimed—that He will "raise up at the last day." If the wicked man has enough of "the higher life-power" to raise him up at the last day, he may be assured the same life-power is fully equal to keeping him alive eternally; for to give life requires more power than to preserve it; and besides, that higher life-power never dies: the law cannot kill it. Prof. H. says—

"There is some indication in the Bible, that the resurrection is not absolutely universal, but is limited to those who have known the revealed will and good pleasure of God. 'They that have sinned without the Law shall also perish without the Law; and they that have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law.' The distinction here made, while it seems to preclude the judgment of the heathen, after a resurrection, 'by the Law'—may expressly denote such a judgment of the ungodly in Christendom."

Thus he gives up John 5: 28, 29 as proof that *all* in the graves shall live again, and admits "the resurrection" may not be "absolutely universal." And, as "they that have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law," will he, or any one else, please give us chapter and verse "in the law" where the "judgment" of any man is said to be "*after* a resurrection"? Where is the law? Just give us the statute. Can it be done? *We*

know it cannot. Do not tell us it "*may* denote such a judgment of the ungodly of Christendom." It *may* NOT denote any such judgment. Where has the *law* said it does? We cannot take conjectures for evidence. Prof. Hudson in closing, speaks thus—

"I conclude then, the resurrection of the unjust has precisely the same relation to the 'second death,' that their present life has to the first death. Life is not for *the sake of* death, just the opposite—yet death is here in this world the common result of life. So the resurrection of the unjust is not for the sake of their aggravated death. It is given to them, freely as this life is—it is the index of many blessings which the Gospel has brought them—and condemnation is the result."

Truly, this is "the conclusion of the whole matter." He says, "Life is not given for *the sake of* death, just the opposite."—Then it must be given for the sake of life. "Yet," he adds, "death is here in this world the common result of life." That is, we suppose, if we did not have life we could not die. How self-evident. "So," saith the Prof., "the resurrection of the unjust is not for the sake of their aggravated death." But he has said, "The wicked dead are raised *not for the sake of* their punishment:" yet death to a sinner is the "wages of sin"—the punishment; and "the second death," as held by him, could not occur without the resurrection, and that death he has elsewhere told us, is "the death of the soul," which did not die with the body in the first death, and so he maintains a resurrection of the wicked dead in order to kill the soul. He says, "My view is simply this—that there are two instalments of death: the death of the body kills it:"***"this death also deprives the soul of its action:"***"the first death destroys the body and not the soul:"***"the second death kills finally and forever." See Bible Exr., vol. 13, pp. 282–3.

"The wages of sin is death," and he affirms the first death does not kill the soul; it is to be killed by a "second instalment of death." As in order to this, the wicked must have a resurrection, must not that resurrection be a necessity, according to his theory? or, must it not be "*for the sake* of death"? How else can the soul be made to die, if his view of "two instalments" is the truth? And if life from the dead is necessary in order to kill the soul—which is a part of the punishment for sin—is not life from the dead given "for the sake of death?" Yea, are not the wicked "*raised up for the sake of being punished,*" not

withstanding the Prof.'s disclaimer? And, though he says, if such is the case, "I know not how to vindicate the *goodness* of God," is it not manifest his theory makes the resurrection of the wicked dead a necessity in order to complete their punishment? and therefore they are "raised up for the sake of being punished." Can he escape the dilemma without abandoning his theory? We think not. Take the following syllogisms.

The wages of sin is death in two instalments.
The first instalment does not kill the soul:
Therefore the wicked dead must live again *for the sake* of killing the soul.

Or, The soul is not killed by the first death:
But the death of the soul is a part of the *punishment* for sin:
Therefore the reliving of the wicked dead is a necessity *for the sake* of destroying the soul.

Would not the Prof.'s idea of the matter involve him, necessarily, in a syllogism much as follows—

Without a resurrection of the unjust the soul would not be killed:
But the resurrection is not *for the sake* of killing the soul:
Yet the death of the soul is the *second instalment* of the punishment for sin.

Or thus—
The soul can only be killed by a second instalment of death:
Therefore the wicked dead will have a revival into life:
But, "*if the unjust are raised up for the sake of being punished,* then I know not how to vindicate the *goodness* of God."

Would the Prof.'s philosophical mind think this a logical argument? We confess it looks to us like the predicament of the man who maintains man is wholly governed by motives; and getting between two motives equally powerful he cannot move at all.

He continues—"The resurrection of the unjust is not for the sake of their aggravated death." If it is in order to give them the "second instalment of death," *viz.*, the death of the soul, will he tell us whether it is, or is not harder to kill the soul than the body? And if it is harder, whether a resurrection to kill the soul is not a "resurrection of the unjust for the sake of their *aggravated death*"?

Men cannot kill the soul, but can kill the body:
Therefore the soul is harder to kill than the body:
Hence the resurrection of the unjust, to kill the soul, is for a more "*aggravated death.*"

To talk of life from the dead being "given to them freely, as this life is;" and of its being "the index of many blessings which the Gospel has brought them," to us, looks so unlike God that we do not believe Prof. H. can ever "vindicate the *goodness* of God" to other thinking minds, if he can to his own, with such a theory. He has evidently become entangled in an inextricable dilemma by trying to avoid the torment theory, on the one hand, and the non-resurrection of the wicked dead on the other.

He says, "Life is not for *the sake of* death, just the opposite —yet death is here in this world the common result of life."— The "result" of a thing, if we understand it, is that which it *produces*. It is that which proceeds from it as a consequence. Can it be said, in propriety of language, that death thus proceeds from life? Death proceeds from sin: in man, it is the "common result" of sin; "sin entered into the world and death by sin," &c.

Again he says—The resurrection life is "given," the unjust, "freely as this life is"***"and condemnation is the result."— Here he seems to hold, condemnation is the consequence of their resurrection: *i. e.*, the condemnation proceeds from a "freely given life" from the dead. The present life is given to men to improve so as to secure an endless life: but the future life is "freely given" to the unjust for no such purpose—their case is helpless and hopeless from the moment it is "freely given." We see no analogy in the gift of the two lives. In this life they may secure the free gift of justification: in that life they can secure nothing—not even condemnation, for that had been secured before this life ended; for, "he that believeth not is condemned already," saith the Saviour.

After all the Prof.'s struggles, we think he will find, life from the dead to the righteous only—life from the dead as a peculiar gospel benefit, conferred on the good alone—is the only Bible theory, and the theory which harmonizes all the perfections of God, humbles man, and exalts our Redeemer and LIFE-GIVER.

"Asleep in Jesus: blessed sleep,
From which none ever wake to weep."

No: they shall hear no more sorrow or sighing; none shall awake except those who "awake and sing," [Isa. 26 : 19, and 1 Corth. 15 : 53-57,] God shall have wiped away all tears forever. No wailing of awakened and despairing sinners shall grate on their ears: no horrible sights are to mar their joys: for the wicked "are dead: they shall not live: they are deceased; they shall not rise." Amen.

THE JUDGMENT: HEB. IX. 27, 28.

IN our remarks on the above text in June, we stated our conviction of the meaning of the apostle, which has called out some strictures from Prof. Hudson. He uses the following language:—

"Mr. S. says: 'Let us hear what Paul did say'—'As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this'—*appointment*—'the judgment,' etc. (Bib. Ex., 1863, p. 157. The italics are his.) This exposition seems itself to need explanation. But none is offered"***"A word is inserted which seems to be required only by the theory of the author," &c. "We ask, then what is meant by the judgment coming after the appointment that man should die? That appointment was made, at the latest, a few days after the foundation of the world. And now we are told that the udgment occurs sometime after that. How much wiser are we made by this interpretation?"—*Rest'n*, p. 31.

It happens, we did give some "explanation," though it is said, "none is offered." We stated the matter thus—

"'It is appointed unto men once to die. After *this*' appointment 'the judgment.' God appointed death once, and only *one* death: after this appointment He institutes the judgment, or *trial* of each individual in his probationary state, which was to decide who should live again: and He caused the proclamation to be made of life through Christ to them who would accept it as a gift in Him. To give this life, He is coming again, and will give it to those, and to such only as '*look* for Him.'— At that hour all others are condemned to *abide* in death and '*not see life*.' Such we regard as the true sense of 'the Word of God.'"

Is here *no explanation offered?* It may not be as full as is desirable, but it is some explanation of our view of the text.— The term *judgment* is not to be understood as having one unvarying sense in the Scriptures. Its sense is various, and one sense of it is, clearly, that of the gospel proclamation. Thus Isa. 42 : 1-7. "Behold my servant" *** "I have put my Spirit

in Him: He shall bring forth *judgment* to the Gentiles"***"He shall bring forth *judgment* unto truth."***"He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set *judgment* in the earth."***"I the LORD"***"will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles: to open blind eyes," &c. Matthew reiterates the Prophet's language—"A bruised reed shall He not break, and smoking flax shall He not quench, till He send forth *judgment* unto victory: and in His name shall the Gentiles trust." Math. 12 : 20, 21.

Is not here clearly brought to view the gospel proclamation? and is not that proclamation the *judgment* spoken of in these texts and others of like character? One definition given of the term judgment by CRUDEN is, "*The gospel, or kingdom of grace.*" And is the EDITOR of this magazine to be censured, because he uses his God-given right to express his conviction that the judgment spoken of by Paul, Heb. 9 : 27, is the dispensation of God's grace, introduced *after* He had appointed the race of Adam once to die? Death was "appointed" to Adam's race without regard to what their moral character might be: after *this* appointment of death, God instituted a judgment dispensation, or a dispensation of love in the second Adam, who should bring forth this judgment, and set it in the earth for the benefit of all men. Those who accepted it, and developed a moral character such as God should require, were to have the benefit of Christ's second appearing, as they had had of His first: such should live from the dead: the others had "judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life" (Acts 13 : 46), and live no more: the appointment "*once* to die" is confirmed on them and made eternal.

Does Prof. Hudson still ask, "What is meant by the judgment coming after the appointment" once to die? and say again, "We are told the judgment occurs some time after that." We reply, the judgment of which we speak, could not in the nature of the case be till *after* this appointment to die; for the judgment, or gospel proclamation, is appointed as a means to deliver man from death, and he needed no such deliverance till *after* he was appointed to death. Does the Prof. still ask, "How much wiser are we made by this interpretation?" We do not know as *he* is any wiser; but it does not therefore follow that no one else is. We have inserted no "word required only by the theory of the author," and we trust no one else has a "theory" which needs to reject it. But be that as it may, we are satisfied our exposition of the text is in harmony with the general tenor of the Scriptures and cannot be *proved* to be erroneous. Besides, the whole argument of the apostle, in the previous part of this chapter, goes to show his mind was on the work of redemption by Christ, and not on judgment in the popular sense of that term. We now submit the subject to our readers.

NO LIFE OUT OF CHRIST.

BY ELDER S. W. BISHOP, WARNER, N. H.

"Because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe."—1 Tim. iv : 10.

THIS text, in connection with some others, is supposed to teach the doctrine of a revival into life, of all men both righteous and wicked, as the grand result purposed by the infinite God in sending his Son into the world to die.

This view of the case argues, of course, that had Christ not died, no such reliving would have taken place. It is urged that the death of the entire race comes on them independently of their agency, and in consequence wholly of the sin of Adam the first. That therefore justice imperatively demands that the second Adam shall redeem all men from the consequences of the sin of the first Adam. This view of the subject makes life from the dead absolutely a matter of debt. That is, God was bound by every principle of justice, to arrange some plan by which the entire race may be unconditionally delivered from the dominion of death. If this position be correct, why quote Rom. v. 18 in proof of a resurrection of all men? Rom. v. 18 positively disproves this position, for Paul declares that the life through Christ is a *free gift*. Now if it be a free gift, it is of *grace*, and not of *debt*. God cannot confer on the human family, as a free gift, by an act of grace, what is their just due.

If it is of grace, it is not of debt, and vice-versa, which is it, of debt or of grace? If it be of debt, then must the plan be so arranged that it will bring to life ALL the dead, or else whoever is left out of the arrangement will have just cause to complain of injustice. If such just cause of complaint does exist, provided the wicked portion of the human family do not get life from the

dead, it follows as a matter of course that if they are made alive it will prove to them a blessing. For where no good is lost, there can be no just cause of complaint; surely no sane person would complain of injustice done him, because he escaped an awful calamity. It must be perfectly evident that if the non-living of the wicked dead deprives them of no future good, there can be no just cause for complaint on their part, if they do not thus live. The question is, then, does their non-living deprive them of any future good? Certainly not, unless they have a probation after being raised with a chance to secure eternal life. My brethren will all admit that no opportunity will be afforded resurrected sinners to repent. It is therefore settled by the consent of all, that no future good awaits the wicked dead; consequently no injustice can be done them by letting them lie in death eternally. But again; the idea that the whole human family can claim a future life, as justly due them from their Creator, presents to my mind the plan of redemption in altogether a false light. It is saying that God was compelled, as an act of justice strictly due the human family, to send his Son into the world to die to save them from the Adamic penalty. This being true, the offering of the blood of Christ was not a free gift; no, no, it was to cancel a debt due from the infinite God to the creature he had made. That text, then, is not true that declares that "God so loved the world that he *gave* his only begotten Son," etc. It ought to have read, God was so in debt to the world, that he sacrificed his Son to square the account.

Paul was mistaken when he said, "by grace are ye saved," according to this view. But where in the Word of God do you find your doctrine of debt? Surely not in Rom. v. That chapter abounds in declarations positive, that the life through Christ is wholly of grace. Read the chapter. Not only so, but Paul declares plainly in that chapter, that the indebtedness is wholly ours. See verses 6, 7, 8. And that life is granted to us as a *free gift*, the abounding grace of God. See verses 15–20 inclusive. There is no doctrine of debt here. This doctrine of debt is not found in Heb. ii. 9, for it is there distinctly asserted that Christ tasted death for every man, not to satisfy a demand justly held by the human family against the Eternal; *but by the grace of God.* It is not found in Rom. ii. 23, 24, for Paul there says we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God; and that we are justified *freely* by the *grace of God*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. This doctrine of debt is not found in 1 Timothy i. 15, for the statement there made is, that Christ came into the world to save sinners. This doctrine of debt is not found in 2 Tim. i. 9, for we are there told, it is according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus. It is not found in Acts xv. 11, for we are there told that we are saved through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.—Finally, this doctrine of debt is not Gospel, for the Gospel is emphatically what it is called in Acts xx. 24, *"The Gospel of the grace of God."* This doctrine of debt only exists in the imaginations of men anxious to sustain a theory. But does the death of Christ secure the reliving of the wicked dead? To suppose that it does, is to suppose that life from the dead is given them by a positive act of redemption through his blood. This being the case, and as, according to every principle of sound reasoning, redemption must better the condition of the person redeemed; therefore if the wicked dead are thus redeemed from death, it must prove to them an unqualified blessing. If their resurrection is a blessing, they are not raised to be punished, unless that punishment is correction, and shall result in their reformation. This no one claims. All admit among us as a people, that when men close their eyes in death, their destiny is unendingly fixed.

It is farther believed, and admitted by all who hold that the wicked dead will live again, that the moment they are conscious in life, they experience a degree of mental agony, such as no mortal ever felt before. This surely can be no blessing. To change a man's condition from unconscious nonentity to a life of the most excruciating torture, whether that torture be mental or physical, surely cannot be redemption. I think if the sinner could be assured that he would escape a calamity of the enormous dimensions of the one named above, he would be entirely willing to lose *such* a part in *such* a plan of redemption (?). But is not a redemption that proves a real curse, a paradox? so we think. If therefore the wicked dead are raised at all, their resurrection must be penal, and that only. They must be raised to be punished; their punishment must be certainly something besides literal death; for they are literally as dead as they ever can be, i. e., if death is an unconscious nonentity till the resurrection. And surely, that God who works all things according to the counsels of his own infinite wisdom, and who has declared that his very nature is love, and that he has *no* pleasure in the death of the wicked, would never raise the wicked to life, and subject them to unabated anguish, unless justice demanded that thus he should do. If simply literal death is the penalty of God's law, justice must be satisfied to leave the sinner in death. Mark, there is no mixed penalty attached to the law of God. It reads distinctly, "the wages of sin *is death.*" If this death is to be construed in its literal signification, every son and daughter of Adam's race who have died in their sins, having died penally, are just as fully under the penalty of God's law as they ever can be, and that law is just as fully satisfied (so far as respects its

claims on the sinner), as it would be if he died ten thousand times. But if death is to be construed in a figurative sense, and means conscious suffering, then, as we have remarked above, the issue is entirely changed, and the doctrine of rendering conscious suffering is clearly involved. That the death which is the penalty of God's law, the wages of sin, is literal death, is proved from the whole tenor of the Scriptures of Truth; we therefore expect no revival of wicked dead into life.—*Restitution.*

MAN AND HIS REDEMPTION.

MRS. L. R. K. BISHOP, Warner, N. H., writes:—The following article is an extract from a private letter written to one of my correspondents. With some hesitation, I have, at the suggestion of a friend, re-written it for the EXAMINER, should you think it will be useful. It contains some of the foundation principles on which rests the doctrine of "no life out of Christ," as they present themselves to my own mind. Not to occupy too much space, I pass all preliminary remarks, and commence my extract with the argument on

"THE PLAN."

"Man, by virtue of his creation, is possessed of an animal nature only; or, in other words, was created an intellectual animal, fully qualified, by his superior intelligence, to comprehend the claims of moral law, and his own obligations to obey the LAWGIVER: and at the same time left perfectly free to choose whether he would, to use a figure, walk up the inclined plane, on which he was placed, to immortality, or down to death. The law given to test man's obedience and thus develop a moral character, was *not* "thou shalt love God with all thy heart," because man had no spiritual nature to meet such a requisition; for the Apostle in contrasting the nature of the *first* and *second* Adam says—'That was not *first* which was *spiritual* but *natural*, (or animal) and *afterward* that which was *spiritual.*' But the test applied to bring out a moral development was perfectly adapted to his animal nature: it was *eat* or *not eat*, with the consequences stated in the plainest terms. Man chose to lay loose rein upon the neck of appetite and ambition, and death followed. But was the sentence of death, that righteous penalty of the law, pronounced upon all men merely because Adam sinned? I answer unhesitatingly, no! Such an idea *offends my sense of right*, and

I think it can harmonize no better with that eternal principle of justice, that is the very foundation of the Almighty's throne.—And this view of the case is materially strengthened, by calling to mind how God reprimanded his ancient people, for using this proverb, 'The *fathers* have eaten sour grapes, and the *children's* teeth are set on edge.' Could He have done so consistently if He had acted on *that very principle* in the beginning? I think not.

"What then is truth? To me, it seems to lie in this direction: God created Adam a *representative man: he* was not only the *head* of the race, but *their representative*, and when he sinned, he acted just as every other animal man would have done, under the same circumstances: consequently, the sentence of death was pronounced upon the whole race, in *his* person, *because he sinned as their representative.* The Apostle states the case thus: 'By man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed through to all men, *for that all have sinned.*'—But *how* have all sinned? First, through their representative, and then personally, as soon as they come to years of understanding; thus proving that they had been *faithfully represented!* Therefore the Apostle says, 'If we say that we have *not sinned*, we make Him a *liar*, and his *word* is not in us,' for that testifies 'there is none that doeth good, no, not one;'****'he hath concluded *all under sin*,' has declared 'the *whole world guilty before God*,' or 'subject to the judgment of God' (margin).

"Thus we see, the law is out against the entire race of man; and the *reason why men die, is because they are sinners in the eyes of the law;* and it will take the only life that man possesses to square his account with his Creator: consequently, when justice is satisfied, having taken the forfeited life, it leaves man in a state of death with no possible way out. Now what? That God whose mercy is just as infinite as his justice, looked upon the race in this helpless condition, going out of life—the grave open at their feet, waiting to swallow them up and hold them in its loathsome prison-house eternally; and 'He so *loved the world* that he *gave* his only begotten Son.' It was a FREE *gift*—the plan is *wholly* a gratuitous one. He had dealt with them on the strictest principles of eternal justice, and yet His great heart of love yearned toward them in their ruined state, and 'He *gave* his only begotten Son that *whosoever believeth* on him should *not perish*, but have everlasting *life.*' In this text is brought to light the whole plan of life through Jesus Christ. Its foundation, 'God so *loved the world*,'—the instrument employed in its execution, 'His *only begotten Son*,'—the *conditions* on which its benefits can be realized, 'whosoever *believeth on him*,'—and last, its aim, or object, and its grand result, 'should *not perish*, but *have everlasting life.*'

"We have seen that the only life man has by virtue of his creation, is forfeited to the law; and as sure as justice lives, it must be yielded up *never to be restored*: consequently, God did not devise a plan to save men from *dying*, and thus cheat justice out of its claim, but it was to save him from *perishing in death;* that is, the plan of Life through Jesus Christ reaches down into the grave, where justice leaves man, and by a new life-principle, obtained through faith in the second Adam—and on which the law could have no claim—it raises him up, making him 'equal to the angels,' to 'die no more.' While then the only life man has *outside* the plan, is forfeited to the law and perishes at death, the *only life* IN THE PLAN is '*everlasting life.*' Can we state then the inevitable conclusion in any better language than that employed by the beloved disciple? 'This is the record that God hath *given* us *eternal life*, and *this life is in his Son; every one that taketh hold of the Son, taketh hold of life;* and every one that taketh *not hold of the Son, hath not life;*' and he adds, on another occasion, he '*shall* NOT SEE LIFE, but the wrath of God' (the penalty of the law) 'ABIDETH ON HIM.'"

REPHAIM.

REPHAIM is a Hebrew word, which occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament *twenty-two* times. For the benefit of such inquirers as do not have recourse to the Hebrew text, we give every passage as it appears in the common version, *italicizing* the word which answers to *rephaim*.

Gen. xiv. 5. "And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlaomer, and the kings that were with him, and smote the *Rephaim* in Ashteroth Karnaim, and the Zuzim in Ham, and the Emim." Gen. xv. 18–21. "The Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the *Rephaim*, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." Deut. ii. 10, 11. "The Emim dwelt therein in times past, and people, great, and many, and tall, as the Anakim; which also were accounted *giants*, as the Anakim; but the Moabites call them Emim." Deut. ii. 20, 21. "That also was accounted a land of *giants: giants* dwelt therein in old time; and the Ammonites call them Zamzummim; a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakim; but the Lord destroyed them before them; and

they succeeded them, and dwelt in their stead." Deut. iii. 11–13. "For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of *giants;* . . . all Bashan, the kingdom of Og, gave I unto the half tribe of Manasseh; all the region of Angob, with all Bashan, which was called the land of *giants*." Josh. xii. 4. "And the coast of Og king of Bashan, which was of the remnant of the *giants*." Josh. xiii. 12. "All the kingdom of Og in Bashan, which reigned in Ashtaroth and in Edrei, who remained of the remnant of the *giants;* for these did Moses smite, and cast them out." Josh. xv. 8. "And the border went up to the top of the mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward, which is at the end of the valley of the *giants* northward."—Josh. xvii. 15. "The land of the Perizzites and of the *giants*." Josh. xviii. 16. "The valley of the *giants* on the north." 2 Sam. v. 18, 22. "And the Philistines also came, and spread themselves in the valley of *Rephaim:* . . And the Philistines came up yet again, and spread themselves in the valley of *Rephaim*." Job xxvi. 5. "*Dead* things are formed from under the waters, and the inhabitants thereof." Ps. lxxxviii. 10.—"Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the *dead* arise, and praise thee?" Prov. ii. 18. "For her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the *dead*." Prov. ix. 18. "But he knoweth not that the *dead* are there; and that her guests are in the depths of hell." Prov. xxi. 16. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the *dead*." Isa. xiv. 9. "Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the *dead* for thee." Isa. xxvi. 14. "Dead, they shall not live; *deceased*, they shall not rise: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." Isa. xxvi. 19. "Thy dead shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the *dead*."

We have been thus exact in presenting the foregoing texts because we wish all our readers to understand the reason why the word *rephaim* is applied in the common version both to the *living* and the *dead*. *Rephaim* is the *plural* of *two different words* —*rephai* and *rapha*. See Gesenius's Lexicon. As the plural of *rephai* it occurs in the first *twelve* passages which we have quoted. In the first *two* of the twelve, it refers to "an ancient Canaanitish tribe beyond the Jordan, celebrated for their gigantic stature." It is used "in a wider sense" in the next *five* of the twelve, and "appears to have comprehended all the gi-

gantic races of the Canaanites, the Ernim, Zamzummim, and Anakim." "From the Rephaim on this side of Jordan was named the Valley of Rephaim." Josh. xv. 8; xvii. 15; xviii. 16; 2 Sam. v. 18, 22.

In the remaining passages—*eight* in number—*rephaim* is the plural of *rapha*, a noun which is derived from the verb *rapha*. The *verb* is defined by Gesenius: "1. Pr. *to sew together, to mend, to repair*. 2. *to heal, to cure*. 3. *to allay, to quiet*." The noun *rapha* takes its meaning from the *third* definition of the verb, and signifies, as Gesenius states, "*properly 'the quiet, the silent.'*" With *this* meaning the plural *rephaim* is applied to *the dead*, who "go down into *silence*." Ps. cxv. 17. Hence Dr. Eadie says that *sheol* is the "world of the *dead*—the region of the *Rephaim* —the *helpless*"—Biblical Cyclop., Art. Hell. In commenting on Isa. xiv. 9, Albert Barnes says that *rephaim* "is applied to the shades, or spirits of the dead, as being weak, feeble, or without power or sensation, from the word *Rapha*, weak, feeble, powerless." (Barnes' expression—"*shades, or spirits*"—is merely the language of his *theology;* it does not belong to the definition of the word in question.) Prof. Pick agrees with the critics already mentioned in defining *Rephaim* "feeble ones, helpless." Dr. J. A. Alexander, reputed by Prof. Green the "greatest of American orientalists and scholars," says on *Rephaim*, Isa. xxvi. 14: "It is here a poetical equivalent to *dead*." Pursuant to Platonic philosophy he translates it "*ghosts*." Prof. Turner in agreement with Dr. A. renders *rephaim* in Ps. lxxxviii. 10—"*shades*."

We think that no one has any right to apply *rephaim*, in the *first* sense mentioned, to the eight passages where it has the *second* sense mentioned. When used in the *first* sense it *always* refers to the *living;* when used in the *second* sense, it *always* refers to the *dead*. In the *first* sense it can *never* be applied to the *dead;* in the *second* sense it can *never* be applied to the *living*. The subject-matter must decide whether *rephaim* refers to *living giants* or to *dead persons*. A glance at the *last seven texts* quoted above will leave no doubt that the word refers to *the dead* in each case.

Another fact must be considered—there is not a text in the Bible where the word means "*wicked* dead." The word *itself* does not decide the *character* of the dead; *that* must be settled

by the *text*. It may refer to the *righteous* dead or to the *wicked* dead. In Ps. lxxxviii. 10, the dead *in general* are spoken of; the verse contains a parallelism; the second line repeats the sentiment:

"Wilt thou show wonders to the *dead* (*methim*)?
Shall the *dead* (*rephaim*) arise and praise thee?"

The passage teaches the *unconscious* state of the dead, and therefore the Psalmist deprecates it. In Isa. xxvi. 19, the *righteous* dead are referred to. "*Thy dead* (*metheka*) shall live . . . the earth shall cast out (bring forth) the *dead* (*rephaim*)."

In the other five instances the subject shows that the wicked dead are meant. In Isa. xxvi. 14, the prophet says of certain earthly oppressors: "They are *dead* (*methim*), they shall not live; they are *deceased* (*rephaim*), they shall not rise."

The prophet does not say that they shall not rise because they are *rephaim*, for that expression is a parallel to *methim*.—Now the wicked are no more *methim* than the righteous are. "THY *methim*," says the prophet is verse 19, "shall live....they shall arise....the earth shall cast out the *rephaim*." Hence *rephaim* is parallel to *methim*—as in verse 14.

The case is very clear and can leave no query in a candid mind. We have three instances where *methim* and *rephaim* occur as parallel terms, and the application is different in each instance. In Ps. lxxxviii. 10, *methim-rephaim* are the dead *without reference to character;* in Isa. xxvi. 14, they are the *wicked* dead; in verse 19, of the latter chapter they are the *righteous* dead. The term *rephaim* is used, in all three places, TO AVOID THE REPETITION OF THE WORD *methim*. The *methim* in Ps. lxxxviii. are shown to be unconscious. The *methim* in Isaiah xxvi. 14, *shall not live—shall not rise*. The *methim* in Isaiah xxvi. 19, *shall* live—the earth shall bring them forth.

In the late discussion—Boston—the affirmative did his best to neutralize the plain statement of Isaiah—ch. xxvi. 14. He quoted verse 19: "The earth shall cast out the dead," and said: "Who are 'the dead' there? The same word rendered 'deceased' in verse 14,—*Rephaim*. Who are the *Rephaim?* I come to a point of interest. Gesenius tells us they are 'an ancient Canaanitish tribe beyond Jordan, celebrated for their gigantic stature.'" (Dis. p. 44). On page 70 he again said:—"Gesenius defines the word *Rephaim*, rendered 'the dead' in

verse 19,—'An ancient Canaanitish tribe beyond the Jordan, celebrated for their gigantic stature.'"

Thus, the foundation of our late opponent's argument against Isaiah xxvi. 14, was a definition of Gesenius. Will our readers believe us when we declare that *no such definition is given by Gesenius?* The definition given does not belong to *rephaim* as used in the text referred to. Gesenius gives it as a definition of the word *Rephaim* as used in Genesis, Deut., Joshua, and 2d Samuel. We hesitate not to say that the affirmative's statement is *utterly untrue*. We transcribe the *real* definition as found in Gesenius: "*Rapha*. Plural, *rephaim*, pr. 'the quiet, the silent,' that is, *the shades, manes*, dwelling in Hades, whom the Hebrews supposed to be destitute of blood and animal life (*nephesh*) but yet not wholly without some faculties of mind; Ps. 88, 11; Prov. 2, 18; 9, 18; 21, 16; Is. 14, 9; 26, 14, 19; c. art. Job 26, 5."

The foregoing is Gesenius' definition of the word in Isaiah xxvi. 14, 19. But this did not suit Elder G.; so he took the same term *rephaim*, where it is used as the plural of *another word—rephai*, as we have shown—and gives the meaning of *this* word as found in Gesenius. The definition given by Elder G. had no more to do with the word under consideration than any other word taken at random out of the Lexicon. Elder G.'s talk on *rephaim* occupies *four* pages of the printed Discussion —*all based on a false definition*. On page 69 he said: "Now we come to the *Rephaim* once more. My friend doesn't let it alone. That is his 'Vicksburg,' his stronghold. *I purpose to take it in the name of the Lord and His word.*" (The italics are ours.) In view of the facts, is not such *cant* contemptible?

Having fixed the spurious definition for a basis, our opponent found himself compelled to perform a feat of twisting. If verse 19 teaches the resurrection of the wicked, verse 14, with far greater emphasis, teaches the contrary. "They are dead, they shall *not live;* they are deceased, they shall *not rise.*" The word *kūm*, translated "*rise*," has a second primary meaning "to stand;" and thence comes to signify "endure," in some places. So Elder G. renders the passage: "They are dead, they shall not live; they are *Rephaim*, they shall not *endure*"—"shall not *continue.*" Did he not see that the structure of the passage *demands* the common version? "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not"—What word will answer to *live* except *rise?*

Elder G.'s *comment* on the text is wonderful: "That race has now run out. There is not a giant left of the Rephaim." Well, *when* did that race run out? He answers (Dis. p. 82), "They are not spoken of as being alive since David and Jonathan killed the last of them, mentioned in 1 Chron. 20: 5-8. They *are dead.*" Well, then, were these *dead giants* (the last, as you say, slain by David and Jonathan, about 1037 years before Christ) "*visited and destroyed*" *by God Himself* 300 years after, for Isaiah to say of them, "*Other lords* beside thee have had dominion over us....they are dead, they shall not live?" Or if, as you claim in another place, this is a part of a "song to be sung in the land of Judah" at the coming of Christ, by what logical process do you identify those tyrannous lords "*visited and destroyed*" by Jehovah with the giants slain by David and Jonathan?

Elder G.'s statement about the death of the last of the Rephaim is not far from the mark (*for him*) "the last" of the *Rephaim* was slain more than *four hundred years* before the exploits recorded 1 Chron. xx. See Deut. iii. 11. *The Rephaim are not mentioned in* 1 Chron. xx.

Finally—the *Rephaim* of olden time NEVER "HAD DOMINION over" Israel. So that the "other lords" were *not* the *Rephaim.*

From the utter failure of our opponent's effort to overthrow the positive statements of Isaiah, we draw the following conclusion—"It is hard to kick against the pricks." J. T. C.

A "LESSON" OF DOGMATISM.

The *Gospel Banner*, (June 1st) published at Geneva, Ill., contains a letter from a correspondent in Springfield, Mass., in which some strictures are made in relation to the teaching and preaching of one "Elder Joseph T. Curry" concerning "Baptism." The writer of the letter says, "he [the said preacher] takes his lesson from George Storrs, who has written a pamphlet entitled the 'Essential Baptism.'"

We suppose that the writer looks upon the said preacher as he would a young robin, which opens its mouth and receiving

whatever the parent bird drops therein without any discrimination. The preacher confesses that he has received more than one "lesson" from the person named; and if he is not very much mistaken, the author of the letter is in the same condemnation, for he is a strong believer in the doctrine of "Life only in Christ," which is the chief "lesson" now taught by George Storrs.

We wonder if the letter-writer is prepared to accept the "lesson" given by the editor of the *Banner* in his response to the letter. The editor says:

"As to the pamphlet alluded to on 'Essential Baptism,' we have not seen one, but from the specimen given in the above communication, presume that we have both read and heard the same arguments before. Over twenty years ago we read a pamphlet against Water Baptism, by one Joseph Barker, a Methodist preacher and reformer, (now a bold infidel;) and one who was on the right track in many things. He took the same ground as Storrs, Curry & Co., that the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was the 'one Essential Baptism,' and that Peter and his brethren were mistaken, and did not understand the commission of their Master, because of their Jewish prejudices. This is very dangerous ground to occupy. It is a pathway leading directly to infidelity. It led Joseph Barker not only to scepticism, but to a denial of the inspiration of the Bible, and to become a bold and public blasphemer of the name of its Divine author. We look upon all such triflers with the authority of the Book and its author, whether professed friends or foes, as all of one class: the only difference being in degree. They are essentially infidel."

Will the letter-writer take this "lesson"? Or will he refuse to remember the Saviour's words, "By *their fruits* ye shall know them"? Does he believe this precious dogmatizer when he says that "Storrs, Curry & Co." "are *essentially infidels?*"

What wholesale slaughter does the said Editor make of truth and common sense! How does he know that Barker's belief in relation to Baptism "LED" him "to a denial of the inspiration of the Bible," and to "blasphene the name of its Divine author"? It is a disgrace to the common cause that such shameless trash should be countenanced by Christians. It is just such talk as this that makes the Advent cause a stench in the nostrils of the people. May the Lord in his mercy save us from ever being identified tin he least degree with men who talk thus!

The editor calls us "triflers with the *authority* of *the Book* and its *Author.*" What a falsehood is this! We merely use the wisdom given us by our Heavenly Father to discover the

true teaching of Christ. But because we are so unfortunate as to disagree in our conclusions with the omniscient editor of the *Banner* we must be branded with *infidelity*! But, thank God, he can *only* rave! God will take care not to commit His cause to such characters. And we will not allow ourselves to think that the correspondent of the *Banner* will accept such a lesson of dogmatism and malignant prejudice as is offered him.

Both correspondent and editor speak of "Eld. Curry's *twist*" in reading John iii. 5, thus: "Except a man be begotten of water, *even* the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." The editor says, "It is 'born out of water *and* spirit'—not *begotten* of or by water, *even* spirit."

We would ask this sapient editor, whether our rendering "*begotten*" is not allowed by the original word? If he has a tithe of the knowledge which we suppose a translator of the Scriptures should have, he is aware that the original word has two senses—"1. to beget, as a father. 2. to *bear, bring forth*, as a mother." The subject matter must decide which is the meaning in every case. In 1 John, v. i., the common version has it both ways. We prefer "*begotten*" in the verse under consideration. Will the editor of the *Banner* say that we have not the critical right? Did he wish to throw dust in his correspondent's eyes by merely playing on the English translation?

Our reasons for preferring the word "*begotten*" are as follows: John i. 13, belongs to the subject. "Which were *born*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of *God.*" The same expression, "born of God," is found in the common translation of 1 John iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 1, 4, 18; five places. Now this phrase is certainly incorrect; for God is not the *mother;* we cannot be *born* of Him. He is the *Father;* hence the phrase should be, as it is in some places in John's Epistle, "*begotten* of God." We think our translators were inconsistent in rendering one word *two* ways in 1 John v. 18. It should be "*begotten*" in both cases.

In 1 Pet., i. 23, we have a clear proof of our position. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed," &c. Every one must admit that the word should be "*begotten*" in this place. The *Divine* generation is referred to: hence we read, "Being *begotten* again, not of *corruptible* seed"—not of blood, nor of

the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man—"but of *incorruptible*"—of God—"*by the word of God*; which liveth and abideth forever."

Our argument is further strengthened by the true reading of John iii. 3, 7. "*Again*," in both verses should be "*from* above," as in the margin. The original word *another* is compounded of the adverb *ano*, "*up, upwards, above*," and the particle *then*, "denoting *motion from* a place." Hence *from above*, is the literal and primary meaning. Dr. Robinson supports this in his Lexicon. But how would it sound to read, vs. 3, 7, "*born* from above." Such is not the case. But we are "*begotten* from above."

Two generations are spoken of by Jesus—one of the *flesh*, the other of the *Spirit*. That which is begotten of the *flesh is flesh*,—a fleshly nature is the result of fleshly generation. "That which is begotten of the *Spirit* is *Spirit*"—a spiritual nature is the result of the Spiritual or Divine generation. Jesus propounded to Nicodemus the great truth, that if a man will have *another* life, that life must be preceded by *another* generation. "Flesh and blood" (the animal nature) "cannot inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. xv. 50. Hence, "except a man be begotten from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Except a man be begotten of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be begotten from above. The wind bloweth where it listeth, but thou canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is begotten of the Spirit." It is a mysterious work, wrought during the mortal existence of the believer, by which his "mortal body" is "quickened," for "it is *the Spirit* that quickeneth." All who are not begotten of the Spirit are of the class referred to by our Lord when he said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have *no life* in you." No quickening principle. He immediately adds: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath* eternal life," (hath the quickening spirit) "and *I will raise him up at the last day*." John vi.

It will be noticed that we do not recognize any *birth* of the Spirit. We are *born* at the *resurrection*, and not before. Our Lord is the first-fruits of the resurrection—"the first-*born* from the dead." But there can be no *birth* whatever without a preceding generation; hence all who are not re-generated by the Spirit of God will fail of the birth—they will not be "the *children* of God, *being* the children of the resurrection." Luke xx.

Having thus vindicated the rendering "begotten," we now inquire what *water* has to do with Christ's subject in his conversation with Nicodemus? Plainly nothing, except as a *symbol*. *Water* is a symbol of the *Spirit* in other places. In His conversation with the Samaritan woman (John iv.) Christ used the word *water* as a symbol of the Spirit. Can any one doubt it? "In the last day, that great day of the feast," He did the same. "*This* spoke He of the *Spirit*." John vii. 37-39. "Rivers of living water" is a symbolic expression for "the Spirit." Why then shall not John iii. 5, be read thus: "Except a man be begotten of water, even the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God"? The Greek conjunction, *kai*, rendered "*and*," may also be rendered "*even*." One instance where it is thus used will be sufficient here. 1 Cor. xv. 24: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God *even*" (Gr. *Kai*) "the Father." When used thus, it is called *kai* explicative.

But let us notice the interpretation of the text as given by the editor of the *Banner*. He says:

> "Jesus was evidently alluding, in this conversation with Nicodemus, to an existing institution, well known to the Jews, to observe which they were called by the Harbinger of the Messiah; for John was then preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; those who refused to submit to that baptism, (which all admit to be an immersion in water), Jesus said 'rejected the council of God against themselves.' But in addition to this, he also taught Nicodemus the necessity of being born of the Spirit."

The editor has hit the nail in saying water baptism was "an existing institution, well known to the Jews." It was a common practice among them, especially the baptism of proselytes. Says Dean Alford:

> "When *men* were admitted as proselytes, three rites were performed —*circumcision*, *baptism*, and *oblation*; when *women*, two—*baptism* and *oblation*. The baptism was administered in the day-time, by immersion of the whole person; and while standing in the water the proselyte was instructed in certain portions of the law. The whole families of proselytes, including infants, were baptized." *Com. on Math.* iii. 6.

Maimonides, the great Jewish Rabbi, says :

"And so in all ages, when a Gentile was willing to enter into covenant, ... and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice."

The Talmud of Babylon says :

"When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised : and when he is cured they baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying, 'Behold he is an Israelite in all things."

The Talmud of Jerusalem testifies the same, with the addition of "sacrifice." The Gemara of Babylon says, "The proselytes entered not into covenant but by circumcision, baptism, and sprinkling of blood."

"When the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem" to question John the Baptist, they did not manifest any wonder at the rite, as if it was a new thing ; they merely questioned his authority as an administrator. "*Why* baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet ?" "Lightfoot cites from the Rabbinical books, testimonies that the Jews expected a general purification or baptism, before the coming of the Messiah (from Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, and Zech. xiii. i.), and that it would be administered by Elias." But they were puzzled to know why *John* baptised ? John answered them, saying, "I baptize with *water :* but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not. . . . . But that *He* should be *made manifest to Israel,* THEREFORE am I come baptizing with *water.*" And John bare record, saying, "I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him. And I knew him not ; but He that sent me to baptize *with water,* the same said unto me : 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He who *baptizeth with the Holy Spirit.*' And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God." See John i.

Have we not the most conclusive evidence in this chapter, that John's baptism was merely *typical,* and to "manifest to Israel" the *real* baptizer with the *essential* baptism ? According to his own testimony, John's baptism was to be *superseded* by a greater. Now if the editor of the *Banner* is correct in his position, that the "water" in John iii. 5, refers to John's baptism, then *we* are justified in *our* position that John's baptism is not an institution for the 19th century, because it was superseded 1800 years ago. So taking his own interpretation of the text *our* case is safe. He says :

"First a water birth ; then a spirit birth. The *first* is the immersion in water of a penitent believer of the Gospel. . . . . The *second* is a spirit-birth, or a physical transformation of flesh into spirit. 'That which is born of spirit is spirit.' It will be as much spirit when born or produced *out of* spirit, as that now born or produced out of flesh is flesh. Jesus is the model—the first-born from the dead—the chief of his brethren."

Our friend's statement is rather rickety. He says the *first* birth "is the immersion in water"—the *second* birth "*out of* spirit." How an *immersion* can be a *birth*—or how going *in* to the water can have any analogy with coming "*out of* spirit" is not clear to us. But this little muddle is native innocence when compared with the stupendous heresy of putting the great spiritual work spoken of by Jesus into the *next age.* We endeavored to uncover this western monstrosity in the Feb. *Examiner.* We showed that the author of the article published in the *Gospel Banner* and headed, "Will there be a resurrection of wicked men ?" denied a vital connection between Christ and the believer in *this life.* He put Christ "the bread of life" in the *age to come.* We now have the heresy reiterated by the editor of the *Banner.* He distinctly states that the "spirit birth" is at the *resurrection.* As he refuses our word "begotten," he is left without any work of the Spirit in this life, which, as we have endeavored to show, is absolutely indispensable in order to obtain a future life. All he has in *this* life is *water !* And yet this spurious theory is called "Gospel" ! And those who claim that the Spirit baptism is the great essential in this life, are said to teach something "extra from the Gospel." The editor says, further on :

"This spirit-birth or change of physical nature is dependent on a preparatory moral and ceremonial change, or a full and implicit obedience now to the revealed will of God."

The editor's ideas are purely Mosaic. In the old dispensation there was a "moral and ceremonial" law, which was binding. But Paul discovered the *carnality* of the *ceremonial* law which was adapted to the child-state of Israel. He says, in Gal. iv. "We, when we were *children,* were in bondage, under the *elements* of the world"—the Mosaic economy. In speaking of

"the first tabernacle," in Heb. ix. he says, it "was a *figure* for the time *then present*, * * * which stood only in meats and drinks, and *divers baptisms*, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the *time of amendment.*" But our editor will not accept the amendment. He still prates of "*ceremonial* change." He speaks of a "*moral change*" which, in connection with the ceremonial, he calls "a *full* and *implicit obedience* to the revealed will of God." He is trying to be "*justified by law.*" But what saith Paul: "By *deeds of law* there shall *no flesh* be *justified* in His sight: for by *law* is the knowledge of *sin.*" Rom. iii. Again, in Philippians iii: "I count all things loss . . . . that I may win Christ, and be found *in Him*, not having *mine own* righteousness, that which is of *law*, but that which is through the faith of Christ." In Gal. v. he says, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by law; ye are fallen from grace."

When will men learn that there is no justification by law—that the Mosaic law, written in stone, was but a dim presentation of God's one great spiritual law—which cannot be apprehended in all its fulness, until we are made entirely spiritual in the resurrection? When will animal men learn that they are condemned by the spiritual law, by virtue of their *inferiority of nature*, and not merely by overt acts? The only thing that the law can possibly do with reference to the animal man is to *condemn* him. Hence to talk of "full and implicit obedience," while we are *incapable* of it, is sheer absurdity. Does the editor of the *Banner* delude himself with the idea that he now renders "*full* obedience" to God? Why his imperfection (not to use a stronger word) is manifested in the very article which we are now noticing. The law says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." This law he has broken in charging "Storrs, Curry & Co." with *infidelity*. If we could review all his writings, all his actions, all his thoughts, how many other and more serious breaches of God's spiritual law would necessarily be uncovered! It was the contemplation of the comprehensive sweep of God's law that led Paul to cry out, "O, wretched man that I am!" And it was only the view of Christ, the righteous, that calmed his troubled spirit. The holiest men that have ever lived have manifested the most profound

self-abnegation and humiliation in view of their shortcomings. John Wesley, on his death-bed, could see no worthiness in himself, but cried out,

"I the chief of sinners am,
But Jesus died for me."

Time would fail us to tell of multitudes of the salt of the earth who have borne the same testimony. *We are not saved because we are worthy*, but because CHRIST IS WORTHY.

"Jesus *thy* blood and righteousness
My beauty are, my glorious dress."

Does the editor of the *Banner* think that an *immersion in water* perfects him? Does he think it brings him a step nearer to God? On the contrary, does he not give us abundant evidence that his theory makes him morose, uncharitable, "ignorant of God's righteousness"? Is it any wonder, then, that he seeks to establish *his own* righteousness"? J. T. C.

CHRISTIAN DEPORTMENT.—A haughty, severe, and stoical deportment, and an unrelenting strictness of opinion, on the social and cheerful enjoyments of life, are far from giving a just and true conception of religion to such as are averse from it, and devoted to the pomps and vanities of life. This severity (instead of convincing them of their errors, and recalling them to the God of mercy and goodness) may harden their minds still more, by representing the worship of God as a system of unceasing hardships and mortification. Many good but mistaken people too often seek to convert and reform others, by exhibiting, in their own practice, certain acts of self-denial.—But it is not in these that true religion consists. When used in moderation, they may, indeed be innocent, and sometimes useful; but God is not to be served only with the words of the mouth, or the bending of the knee; it is the pure and upright heart which he requires, and with which alone he will be satisfied.

With this pure and upright frame of mind, we may live in the world without either affectation or singularity, and cheerfully conform to its reasonable amusements, and yet preserve the most strict subjection to our duty to God.***This is true religion, and the service of God—of that God, who made the world and all things in it, and who, although a jealous God, is the God of love, who delights in the happiness of his creatures. All other ways of serving him are but the outward forms of ceremonies instituted by bigotry and superstition.—*Fenelon.*

THINKERS.—The world owes a vast debt to its thinkers (and they are not a great multitude, in the highest and sublimest sense of thinking). I call not him a thinker who travels in the old ruts and grooves of accepted opinion.***I call him a thinker who, in the realm of opinion and research, is a brave pioneer, far ahead of the common lazy throng of obsequious brains, exploring untrodden realms and climbing up acclivities hitherto untried in mental adventure. Admit that such men are sometimes heretics and extremists; yet I would rather be a heretic and an extremest in some degree than have it said of me when I am dead, that I found the world at my birth anchored in the mud of an old false prejudice, and lived three-score and ten years, and died and left the world, as far as respected one brave manly endeavor of mine, as much in the mud as ever. Nay, I would rather give the world one single new good thought and die like an ephemera than live a million of years like a bivalve of the sea-beach, inert and embedded in the darkness of cowardice and bigotry.—*J. L. Corning.*

DEATH.—When we survey death at a distance—when, in youth, health, and vigor, we cast our eyes towards the grave, our reflections are transient, and we are unmoved by the awful prospect; but when sickness, age, and infirmities show us the near approaches to the tomb, our weak nature turns with horror from the idea of dissolution. It is only through faith in the promises of God, and hope in the infinite merits of our Redeemer, that we can steadfastly look on death, and overcome the terrors which the most perfect of mortals must feel at puting off mortality.***Death is to the best an awful summons, and human nature turns from the bitter cup; but let our spirit say with our blessed Lord—"My God! not my will, but thine be done."—*Fenelon.*

THE GREAT CAUSE of Christian fear and despondency is want of faith. Faith is the chief corner-stone of the spiritual temple, and the only source of true confidence. It hushes fears—it silences doubts—it alleviates afflictions—it rolls off burdens. It makes trials pleasures, and sorrows sweet. It calms the soul in the hour of bereavement, fortifies it in the hour of death, and lightens up the grave with the radiance of immortality.

OUR business is to see a perfect conformity to the will of God, and then leave him to give us such comfort as he sees good.

LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST: A NEW ERA.

THE day has dawned—the Life views are no longer to be refused a place in a *weekly* periodical, but are to take a stand among other truths of the Bible before a reading world. It will be seen, by the following document, that the friends of "Life only in Christ" are determined to take hold in earnest, in reliance on the LIFE-GIVER; and we trust all the friends, in every part of the country, will take hold with a firm resolution that there shall be hereafter no lack of *means* or efforts to carry forward the great and glorious work GOD has committed to our hands.—EDITOR.

AT A MEETING held near Wilbraham Camp-Ground, August 29th, 1863, the following persons were present: George Storrs, Rufus Wendell, W. S. Campbell, Dwight J. Weaver, James L. Boyd, Thomas Weaver, Willett H. Hanford, William Roworth, R. E. Ladd, Caleb Thompson, S. F. Rogers, Albert Fox, George K. Carroll, Royal Boston, Joseph B. Eggleston, Leonard Plumer, Ozias Clapp, A. W. Macdonald, S. W. Bishop, George W. Denny, Isaac L. Allen, Henry J. Sweetland, Andrew C. Jenkins, Joseph T. Curry, William Stark, G. L. Rice.

Rufus Wendell was chosen Chairman, and Joseph T. Curry Secretary. After some remarks it was voted that a Committee of four be appointed by the Chairman to act with him in considering a plan of operations for the spread of the doctrine of Life only in Christ; the said plan to be reported to this body at its next meeting.

The Chair appointed W. S. Campbell, J. T. Curry, George K. Carroll, and S. W. Bishop. Adjourned to meet at four P. M.

In consequence of the extreme length of the afternoon sermon from the Stand, the body did not meet till five P. M. The Committee having given their report, remarks were made concerning a name for the body.

Voted that we constitute ourselves a Society under the following name—"*The Life and Advent Union.*"

Voted that the officers of this Union be a President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer.

Voted that a Committee of five be appointed by the Chair to nominate officers. The following were appointed:—James L. Boyd, Geo. K. Carroll, Isaac L. Allen, Royal Boston, and S. F.

Rogers. After retiring to consult together, they reported the following persons: For President, George Storrs; for Vice-President, Rufus Wendell; for Secretary, Joseph T. Curry; for Treasurer, Leonard C. Thorne. Report received. The persons nominated were elected by a unanimous vote.

W. S. Campbell, Rufus Wendell, R. E. Ladd, J. T. Curry, and Ozias Clapp were constituted a Committee to draft and report a Constitution.

Adjourned till 8 A. M., August 30.

8 A. M. August 30, 1863. Roll called by the Secretary.—The following additional names were received as members of the Union: Nathan Lazell, Walter Stickney, Ophir Haynes, S. S. Brazee, John Crosbie, Barnet Matthias, Arnold H. Tourtelot, Henry J. Chamberlain, Luther Paine, S. Cooper, John S. Armington, Russell Barnard, Jacob J. Johnson, V. N. Davis, William W. Doughty.

The following names were suggested by members present on the supposition that the persons named, though actually absent, would doubtless indorse the action of the individuals who presented them: William H. Thorne, Leonard C. Thorne, Philo Richardson, Edward Lloyd, James T. Cornell, D. B. Salter, William H. Doughty, A. Decker, William Payne, George W. Brown, Charles Gardner, William A. Smith, William Munger, A. H. Landon, Willard M. Hall, C. D. Leet, George W. Wiggin, Nathaniel Davis, Joseph Thomas, Lewis Gunn, John Billings, Charles A. Hastings, John Speir, and Rollin Harrison.

The Committee on Constitution reported. After various alterations and amendments their report was adopted. The following Constitution was formally established:

"We, the members of 'The Life and Advent Union' do mutually agree to the following

CONSTITUTION.

"Article. I. The object of this Union is to use all available means to promulgate the Doctrine of Life only in Christ, the Personal, proximate Advent of our Lord Jesus, and all sentiments calculated to spread vital godliness.

"II. Any person believing in Life through Christ alone, (thereby denying any future life to unbelievers,) and sustaining a Christian character, may become a member of this Union by subscribing to the Constitution.

"III. The officers of this Union shall be a President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Thirteen Directors, who together shall constitute the Managing Board, and who are to be elected annually.

"IV. The Managers shall be authorized to collect funds for the Union, which fund shall be transmitted to the Secretary, who shall keep account of the same and transfer them to the Treasurer.

"V. The Board of Managers shall have power to choose an Executive Committee from their number to facilitate business.

"VI. All receipts for the Union shall be published monthly by the Secretary with the name of the donor.

"VII. The Annual meeting and such other meetings as may be deemed necessary by the Board of Managers, shall be called by giving six weeks' notice.

"VIII. The Secretary shall keep a record of the names and Post-office addresses of the members.

"IX. This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any annual meeting."

The following Directors were unanimously elected: Randolph E. Ladd, J. L. Boyd, Ozias Clapp, S. W. Bishop, W. S. Campbell, S. F. Rogers, Isaac D. Allen, Walter Stickney, Albert Fox, Caleb Thompson, John Billings, A. Decker, Jacob J. Johnson.

Voted that the Secretary report the proceedings of the Union in the next number of THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

Voted that such members of the Board of Managers as are present be constituted a Committee to confer together with reference to the publication of a weekly newspaper.

Voted that a Committee of five be chosen to solicit pledges of money at this Camp-meeting in aid of the Union.

J. T. Curry, Rufus Wendell, Albert Fox, Gilbert L. Rice, Henry J. Sweetland were appointed.

The Union joined in prayer with George Storrs.

Adjourned to meet at 1 P. M.

1 P. M. Roll called. The following additional names were recorded: N. D. Wight, Madison Weaver, Phineas A. Sherman, Hiram E. Twing, Mary Twing, Helen Robertson, E. C. Paine, Joseph K. Marshall, Timothy Oliver.

The Committee on the weekly paper reported. Report accepted. It consisted of the following items, which were unanimously adopted:

1. The paper shall be called "*The Herald of Life, and of the Coming Kingdom.*"
2. It shall be published in New York City.
3. The Union shall have an Editorial and Printing Office of its own.
4. The Union will discharge the obligation of George Storrs to the Bible Examiner subscribers for the months of November and December by sending as many copies of the newspaper as

will furnish an equivalent. The Bible Examiner to be *suspended* in favor of the new paper, after its next issue.

5. The paper shall be under the immediate control of an Editorial Board, composed of GEORGE STORRS, *Editor*; and Rufus Wendell, J. T. Curry, W. S. Campbell, and S. W. Bishop, Assistant Editors.

6. RUFUS WENDELL shall be *Business Agent*.

7. The salary of the Editor shall be Twelve Dollars per week.

Voted that the subscription price of the paper shall be Two Dollars per year.

Voted that the paper be conducted on the cash principle.

Voted that the paper be not started until the sum of One Thousand Dollars is in the hands of the Treasurer, aside from the subscriptions for the paper.

Voted that Advent preachers have permission to publish their appointments in the paper.

Adjourned *sine die*.

JOSEPH T. CURRY,
Secretary.

TO THE FRIENDS of the New Movement, *Greeting*: "The Life and Advent Union" is an institution. Earnest, Christ-loving men have inaugurated it, and God's smiles have warmed it into life. Our first object is to start a new weekly paper on a substantial basis. It has been decided not to do any thing until the sum of One Thousand Dollars is in the hands of the Treasurer. Those who have already given their pledges of money will please forward it as soon as possible, that the enterprise may go forward at once. Those who have not yet been heard from are respectfully informed that their pledges and money may be sent either to the President, Secretary, or Treasurer. Perhaps the speediest way of communication at present is to send to the President—GEORGE STORRS, Box 4658, *New York*. Letters to the Secretary must be addressed, for the present—JOSEPH T. CURRY, care of *O. Clapp*, 30 & 32 Winter-St., *Boston*, Mass. Letters to the Treasurer are to be directed—LEONARD C. THORNE, 36 Church-St., *New York*. The Secretary will be pleased to hear from all persons who desire to be members of the Union by subscribing to the Constitution. Above all, let fervent prayers ascend to "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," that the word of Life may have free course and be glorified through

the instrumentality of "The Life and Advent Union." "The Lord is our power, the Lord will provide." Amen.

JOSEPH T. CURRY.

PLEDGES.—The Secretary of "*The Life and Advent Union*" will acknowledge all sums of money received for the Union in the first number of the new paper. J. T. C.

PROGRESS.—Believers in "*Life only in Christ*" will be gratified to hear from the late Camp-meeting at Wilbraham. The truth has progressed during the past year, and the evidences were abundant throughout the week. The prayer and conference exercises in the Springfield tent, were exceedingly interesting. The central power expressed its conviction of the influence of the new movement by nailing its favorite text (John 5 : 28, 29) above the Preachers' Stand. Much interest was felt in relation to the question whether the EDITOR of the Examiner would be permitted to preach from the Stand this year. A Committee was chosen to confer with the Camp-meeting Committee on the subject. The latter called the preachers together to decide. A vote was taken and a large majority decided that GEORGE STORRS should preach. He delivered his discourse the same (Friday) evening; and although it rained the most of the time but few retired until the close. It is believed that many were powerfully convicted of the truth by the sermon. The Spirit of God was felt in a gracious manner. "Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord." Brethren Bishop and Campbell also delivered valuable sermons on the Life theme in the course of the meeting. J. T. C.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—It is proper to say, in addition to the Secretary's report, that more than seven hundred dollars were pledged on the spot, at the organization of the "UNION." Many of the most able friends were not present; we shall look to hear from them, and trust it will be a liberal response, and doubt not it will be. If the "one thousand dollars are paid in"—as we trust they will be—before this month is closed, the first number of the new paper will be immediately issued.—To carry forward the work with energy, there ought to be at least *two* thousand dollars put into the hands of the TREASURER immediately.—Other works are to be issued besides the "HERALD OF LIFE," &c. Let the friends in every place call a meeting and act at once: or, if they are isolated, send on your personal pledges or the amount you may be disposed to give to this grand enterprise. It is desirable to commence our work in earnest immediately.

"THE LIFE AND ADVENT UNION."—RUFUS WENDELL writes: I wish cordially to congratulate the friends of truth that this new organization has been formed. Its origin and object are sufficiently set forth in the Report which its Secretary lays before the readers of the BIBLE EXAMINER. It is the offspring of a desire, long cherished in the minds of some individuals, to bring about systematic and well-directed co-operation in effort among the friends of the precious doctrine of Life only in Jesus Christ. Not a few of us have long felt that the growing prevalence of this glorious truth demanded that its advocates (by which I mean all who have received the doctrine in the love of it) should consolidate their labors and influence, for its more efficient promulgation. But *how*, *when*, and *where* the initiative should be taken for the achievement of an end so desirable, was a problem more easily proposed than solved. The object has, however, been kept steadily in view, and, in spite of all seeming discouragements, we have labored on *in hope*, fully persuaded that the time would arrive for us to assume and maintain a position, with reference to this vastly important theological reform, far more advantageous than any we have hitherto occupied. The opportune moment seems at length to have arrived. The advance step has been taken at last.—That it has not been prematurely taken, is abundantly attested by the zeal and unanimity exhibited by those who took part in our deliberations at Wilbraham. THE LIFE AND ADVENT UNION has been formed and entered upon its mission. We commend it to the blessing of Almighty God, and to the prayers of such of His dear children as sympathize with the work which it is designed to promote. For the spread of His holy truth, and the upbuilding of His church in the blessed hope of the gospel, was it conceived and set on foot, and now our dependence is upon Him for guidance in carrying forward its operations.

It will be seen by the Secretary's Report, the first work to which *The L. & A. Union*, after its formation, turned its attention, was the subject of having a weekly religious paper. As a result, our friends have before them a fully developed plan in this direction, and in a few weeks they will be called upon to pass judgment upon "THE HERALD OF LIFE, AND OF THE COMING KINGDOM." I feel persuaded that this movement will be hailed with deep satisfaction by nearly all believers of Life only in Christ, and by many others. I say by many others, for it will be the earnest aim of the Editor and his Assistants to adapt the paper to the varied wants of the Life and Advent body at large. We anticipate that it will grow in favor with large numbers of those even who will be slow to accept the argument for that aspect of the great Life theme which it will steadfastly proclaim to a perishing world. Other subjects, pregnant with thrilling interest, will also receive constant attention in its columns,

and we trust that the paper is destined to enter upon a career of wide and ever increasing usefulness. But on these points more will be written in the paper itself, by those better able than I am to say the right things in the right way.

It only remains for me to express the hope that all the patrons of the EXAMINER will cheerfully support "THE HERALD OF LIFE," and do all in their power to give it a large list of paying subscribers.

—

WM. STARK, Penn Yan, N. Y., writes, Sept. 1st: "Herewith *ten* dollars to redeem my pledge to 'THE LIFE AND ADVENT UNION,' under the sacred chestnut tree, which the LORD preserve."

NOTE BY ED.—"The sacred chestnut tree" spoken of, stands in an open field, *alone:* a noble tree, in Wilbraham, Mass. Under its widespread branches, and around it, "The Life and Advent Union" was formed and all its business transacted, as reported by the "*Secretary*," J. T. Curry. That *tree* stands as a witness to what we regard as one of the most important religious movements of this century. "A grain of mustard seed" it may be in the commencement, but we have the fullest confidence it will increase under the dew and rain of heaven, and the warming influences of that divine life which the great LIFE-GIVER will impart, till multitudes will gladly take refuge within its branches or under its shadow from the plague of "*Spiritualism*" and the "*Torment*" theories which have been and are carrying their withering blasts through Christendom, deceiving multitudes of Christians and sinners; in the first, crushing out the pure love of God which characterized the early Christians, and driving sinners to the rejection of Bible Christianity, by a false view of its Author and His revelations. In the name of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and in dependence on Him, "*The Life and Advent Union*" has come into being, and trusts to be enabled to accomplish its work. Let praying and working men and women throughout the land come up to the help of the LORD in spreading *life-giving* truth every where.

—

EIGHT PAGES have been added to this number of the EXAMINER to make room for the "Report of the Secretary" of "*The Life and Advent Union*," and other communications relating thereto. "*The Herald of Life*," or this magazine will appear early in October, we expect.

—

DONATIONS FOR THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—W. S. Olmsted (his monthly subscription) $1. "Once a month," $2. Allen Logan, $1. Eld. J. Craig, $1. G. W. Denny, $3. Geo. T. Collins, $5. R. L. Jaques, Esq., $10. Friends in Boston, $6,75.

NOTICE.—From the time "*The Herald of Life*," *etc.*, commences its issue, the BIBLE EXAMINER will be *suspended;* and what may be due to the subscribers of this magazine will be paid them in the *new paper*, if they do not object. If they choose, however, to *pay* for the "*Herald of Life*," from its outset, and hold their claim on the EXAMINER for the remainder of this volume, we shall satisfy them accordingly; but the first number of the new paper will be sent to all subscribers of this magazine, and we trust they will gladly accept it, and send at once as many new ones as possible. Persons sending five subscribers to "*The Herald of Life*," with the pay in advance, will have the sixth copy *gratis*. All communications in relation to it, for the present, may be addressed to us, "*Box* 4658, *New York*." Other arrangements will be made on the issue of the first number of the new paper.

THE HERALD OF LIFE,

AND OF THE COMING KINGDOM.

GLAD TIDINGS.—"*The Life and Advent Union*" are determined to issue a weekly paper, at *New York City*. This determination proceeds from a spirit of unconditional loyalty to the Government of JESUS CHRIST, and to the great principle that He is the only LIFE-GIVER for dying men; and believing the time for the establishment of His Kingdom on earth is not far off, but is fast approaching. "The Union" goes forth to its work in reliance on GOD and the power of His truth; it asks each and every one who loves the truth and who is able to help, to do so by subscribing to its funds, and especially by subscribing for the paper themselves and soliciting others to do the same.

The TERMS of "The Herald of Life," &c., will be $2 per year, exclusive of postage or delivery. Half-yearly subscriptions will be received, but all who are able should pay for the year, at once. The following blank form of a subscription list is attached to help those disposed to get subscribers:

Names of Subscribers. [Write plain.]	Post Office Address.			Amount Paid.
	Name of Office.	County.	State.	

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

THIS *Magazine* is devoted mainly to Bible questions; specially to the great themes of JESUS CHRIST'S personal return to, and reign on earth—Life, future and eternal, only through Him—and literal death, never to be revoked, as the wages of sin.

It is intended to be issued *Monthly*, 32 pages octavo. TERMS, *One Dollar* for 12 numbers; paid in *advance*.

REMITTANCES.—Persons making communications to us, will please consider it a *receipt* for money they send, if they receive what they write for, instead of our acknowledging their letters in the EXAMINER. Generally, in case of remittance, they receive what they order before the acknowledgment could appear in our Magazine. To *print* all the names of Correspondents is attended with inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

LETTERS should be well sealed, but never "registered." Money for the EXAMINER is at the *Editor's* risk, when sent as herein directed, without adding to, or omitting any thing from the directions. If this course is not complied with, it is at the risk of the person remitting.

MONEY sent for any of the works in our *Catalogue* of Books, is at the risk of the *purchaser*, except when the *retail* price is remitted, then it shall be *mutual*. The risk is small, if our instructions are strictly followed; we will not be responsible in any degree unless this is done. Be careful, in all cases, not to send depreciated Bank bills. We have had to pay *twenty* per cent. on some funds sent us, or else return the money. This ought not to be.

THE POSTAGE on the *bound* Examiner, for 1860, is *twenty-six* cents, any distance less than 3000 miles.

☞ We invite our friends to examine the *Catalogue* of works, on the last page of this cover, and send for such as they can make profitable to themselves or others. By doing this, you will benefit the cause we advocate, and help the EDITOR of this Magazine.

Invariably address, GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New-York*.

—:o:—

STANDING RULES FOR WRITERS FOR THIS MAGAZINE.

1. Each writer is required to state his own views on the topic he takes up, without a direct personal controversy with any other writer in our columns. This course does not restrict liberty of expression on any topics others have presented, but is designed to save personal feelings.

2. Each individual correspondent is *alone* responsible for the sentiments of his article: the fact of the insertion is not to be construed as an approval by the EDITOR.

3. The main object of this Magazine, as expressed on its cover, must be kept in view by all writers: other topics may, however, sometimes be admitted, if space will allow.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS:

FOR SALE AT THE BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

On all books and pamphlets, sent by mail, the postage has to be *pre-paid.* The following works will be sent, any distance under 3000 miles, postage free, on receipt of the retail price; except the *bound* EXAMINERS.

SIX SERMONS on the inquiry, *Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering?* To which is added a sermon on *Christ the Life-giver*, or the faith of the Gospel, by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner;* with an Introduction defending the Bible and its Author against Infidels. This work contains double the amount of matter of the original Six Sermons. *Price,* in plain binding, 50 cents; in paper covers, 30 cents.

THE WATCH TOWER: OR, MAN IN DEATH; *and the Hope for a Future Life.*—A Pamphlet of 96 pages. A thorough cure for the modern *necromancy*, misnamed "*spiritualism*," which is really *animalism*. *Price,* 20 cents.

LIFE FROM THE DEAD; or, *The Righteous only will live again.* By the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. The author believes this subject is one of vast importance. It illustrates the whole Gospel scheme, and shows the mercy of God in its true light, while man is seen to be wholly mortal. It cuts up the modern *man-worship*, which is hurrying so many on to rank atheism. *Price,* 20 cents.

LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.—This embraces the whole of the three previous named works, and the Tract on Atonement, bound in one volume of 360 pages, and lettered on the back. It contains a full view of the doctrine of "*No life out of Christ,*" as held by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price,* $1.

MAN'S DESTINY.—*Immortality:* The Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D.D., St. Louis, Mo., *Reviewed* by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. A very valuable work. *Price,* in pamphlet, 30 cents.

BIBLE VS. TRADITION: in which the True Teaching of the Bible is manifested: showing the true meaning of the terms *Soul, Spirit, Hell, Everlasting, Eternity, Life, Death,* &c. An invaluable help to understanding the Scriptures. *Price,* bound, 75 cents. A cheap edition, in paper covers, 40 cents.

OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN.—This work was written by Prof. WILSON, England, some years since. We republished it, believing it could not fail to interest all thinking men, whatever might be thought of the accuracy of its positions. For ourself, we indorse the general theory that the *Anglo-Saxons* are the literal descendants of Israel, in the line of Joseph and Ephraim. Price, 50 cents, in paper covers only.

BIBLE EXAMINER *bound;* Vol. 13, $1.75. Vol. 14, $1.85. This includes the postage: $1.50 each without the postage.

TRACTS AND SMALL WORKS.

MAN'S NATURE AND DESTINY; or, the Animal man and the Spiritual man. A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price,* 5 cents.

LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN; or, Life only through Christ, not a heresy; by Dr. J. K. FINLEY, Pittsburgh, Pa. *Price,* 5 cents.

THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM: by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price,* 7 cents.

THE ATONEMENT: by GEO. STORRS. *Price,* 3 cents.

DOOM OF THE UNGODLY; or, *The Wicked Dead remain eternally under death's dominion.* A Sermon by GEO. STORRS. *Price,* 5 cents.

Other Tracts will be added, if funds are to be had.

Orders for any of these works may be left with GEO. W. YOUNG, 35 Ann-St., New York.

All *Letters* sent by mail, must be addressed,

GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New York.*